

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 15, 1994

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, February 11, 1994, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] for 5 minutes.

## THE POLITICS OF SELF-DESTRUCTION AND SELF-DECEPTION

The SPEAKER. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk this morning about the politics of self-destruction and the politics of self-deception. I am citing, as my text, two articles in this morning's Washington Post, because today's Washington Post has two stories that will help Americans understand the bizarre and destructive world of Washington.

On page 1, President Clinton is quoted in a Boston speech attacking the Republican Party for what he calls the politics of personal destruction, and quotes the President as saying that the Republicans have no proposals, no solutions, and are unwilling to cooperate. He goes on apparently to say no, no, no, eight times as a sign of Republican intransigence.

Let me suggest if I might, Mr. President, that the speech in Boston is an exercise in the politics of self-destruction, and the politics of self-deception. Let me take those two independently.

It was not Republicans who delivered subpoenas to the White House and to the Treasury. That was an independent counsel. It is not the Republicans who raised the question about Mr. Hubbell's law firm. That was the partners of the Rose law firm themselves. It is not Republicans who talk about Small Business Administration fraud. That is Judge David Hale in Little Rock. It is not Republicans who have raised question after question. That has been the New York Times, the Washington Post, the national networks, the Wall Street Journal.

It is, in fact, very self-destructive for the President to continue to deny the reality of his problems, and as late as today there is apparently confusion now about whether they invested \$69,000 or \$13,000, and there is apparently confusion about whether they paid all of their taxes or owe as much as \$16,000 in back Federal taxes.

Now, it is self-destructive for President Clinton to avoid the reality that this is a mess, not a mess made by any Republican. We did not create the Whitewater Corp. We did not run the Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan. We are not partners in the Rose law firm. And we have not been involved in having improper conversations in the executive branch.

There is a second part of this, which is the politics of self-deception. I have to say, as somebody who cooperated totally in helping pass NAFTA on a bipartisan basis, I find it very sad and very, very lacking in fairness and in truthfulness for the President to pound the table and yell no, no, no as though it was the Republican position. The President personally hosted Senator DOLE and five other Republican Senators recently to talk about health care. They had dinner together talking about health care on a bipartisan basis. The President knows full well, from personal meetings, we have offered to help on welfare reform, where the House Republicans have a welfare reform bill and the Democrats have not even submitted one.

The President knows that we have offered to help pass a crime bill, because I have been in personal meetings with him and have offered to provide Republican votes to pass a strong crime bill with a three-strikes-and-you-are-out provision that locks up violent criminals.

The President knows that what he said in Boston last night did not communicate fairly and accurately to the American people what in fact has been going on as Republicans have offered again and again to be bipartisan.

But on page 4 of the Post today, my good friend, the majority leader, is quoted as saying they are going to have to pass a health bill in the House with only Democratic votes. Now, the President claims there is no Republican plan. In fact, there is a Chafee plan, which has been talked about a great deal.

There is a Nickles-Stearns plan, which has been talked about. Senator GRAMM has a plan. But the plan which has the most supporters is the Michel-Lott plan.

Let me report to the House how ironic this is. H.R. 3080, the Michel-Lott bill, has 141 cosponsors. The bill introduced by the majority leader, which is the President's plan, has 103 cosponsors. So not only do Republicans have a plan, Republicans have a plan which has more cosponsors in the House than the Democratic Presidential plan.

My only point is this: Mr. President, it is self-destructive to circle the wagons around the White House and avoid getting to the heart of this stuff and getting Whitewater behind us, and it is self-deceptive to believe that the only pure person seeking to be bipartisan is yourself.

On behalf of the Republicans in the House, I want to say that on welfare, on crime, on illegal aliens, on the issue of national defense, on foreign policy, and on health, we are prepared today to meet with the Democratic leadership, and we are prepared to work with the President, and any other assertion on his part is disingenuous.

## THE BALANCED-BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I want to take my time this morning and take advantage of this opportunity to talk about the balanced budget, and more specifically the balanced-budget amendment.

This week, the House will be considering a balanced-budget amendment. This is an issue, it seems to me, of utmost importance to the country and to the future, and I am glad that we are having the debate.

I think the basic principle is we cannot continue to expect things to change as we do the same things over and over again. We have been through this year after year after year expecting different results by continuing to do the same things. Obviously that principle does not work.

I hope Americans will watch this debate closely, because it clearly defines two different philosophies of Government, two different philosophies about the operation of the Federal Government.

Frankly, as we come upon an election time, that is what elections really ought to be. There ought to be a great debate about choices, general choices

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of how we proceed, what we expect, what our expectations are.

Do we want more Government? Do we want less? Do we want more Federal Government? Do we want less? Do we want more taxes? Or would we like less? Are there appropriate roles for the Federal Government to expand? Could we transfer more and more of that to local government? These are basic debates that ought to be carried on and carried into the election so that we have candidates that have a philosophy.

Obviously voters will never know of all the kinds of issues that Members of Congress or other elected officials will deal with, but they should know the philosophy against which they measure those issues, and that is what this great debate is about.

Opponents of the balanced-budget amendment will come back this year with the usual, I think, trite, worn-out statements of opposition to doing something about the balancing of the budget. They will have scare tactics, half-truths, and twisted logic. But the American people will not be fooled by that.

The Chicken Little arguments that the world will end and the sky will come crashing in, or watered-down substitutes, will not serve a purpose.

What will we hear? First of all, we will hear the defenders of the status quo who will tell us the amendment is not needed. Wait a minute; wait a minute. How many times have we balanced the budget in the last 55 years? I think about three or four. It has been 25 years since we have had a balanced budget, 25, so we say, "Oh, it is not needed, all we need is the political will to balance."

They will say that the deficit is down this year, and it is. I am pleased for that. Why is it down? It is down because we had the largest tax increase in the history of the Congress. It is down because we have a continuation of the 1991-92 economic growth, and that is good. It has increased revenue.

Look where it is projected over the next several years, back up, \$1 trillion added to the debt. Not needed?

Give me a break. Of course it is needed. We have to have the political will to do something about the process.

In my view, we need a balanced budget amendment. We need a line-item veto. Those are things that we need very, very clearly.

We will hear the notion that it is a gimmick, the balanced budget is a gimmick, that it does not work. Let me tell you I can certify it works from my State of Wyoming. We have a balanced-budget amendment in the constitution. We have to balance the budget. You either raise taxes to get more revenue, or you cut the budget to make it fit. Those are the appropriate decisions you have to make. That is the kind of cost-benefit ratio that each of us ought

to consider and taxpayers ought to have a chance to consider.

□ 1040

Defenders of the status quo will say, "Oh, we will need draconian, crippling changes in the budget," and, "We just can't stand doing that." The fact is that it does not insist that it be done over the next 3 years or 5 years, I suppose even 10 years; the important part is that we are on a course of a balanced budget with the constitutional discipline.

So, we can take some time, and it will take some time. It will not be as difficult as we think, however. If you ever take a look, go back home in your own town or county and try to decode all the Federal spending that takes place there and ask yourselves with each one, "How is my life impacted by that? Is my life going to end if we do not do that one," there are plenty of places to cut. Remember, this budget that we are talking about, the President has talked about a lot of tough cuts; but there are no cuts, just transfers from one program to another. This budget is \$30 billion more than last year. There are no cuts. So we need to remember that.

The status quo-ers will tell us that economic devastation would follow; of course that is not true. We have to make a decision as to what the role of the Federal Government is, whether or not the people in this country can take their money and spend it as they choose—that is, the bureaucrats—or if the American public can take it themselves and make a better decision. This is one of the most important basic philosophical decisions we will have this year, certainly, or any year, because it has to do not with the numbers in a budget, it has to do with how do you get the Government's role out of your life, how do we deal with the increases in entitlements, those kinds of things, as opposed to solving problems by putting effort into certain sectors, more investment for jobs so people can own their own home, so people can pay for their children's education, have a retirement program of quality, secure employment which is created in the private sector.

So these are broad issues, issues that I think should be addressed in a balanced budget discussion. I hope they are. I hope we are not fooled by all the ideas that it will not work. In fact, it will work.

#### CLINTON'S WHITE-HOT WHITEWATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the White House has taken Whitewater

from white lies to whitewash to white knuckles. Now Webster Hubbell, the No. 3 person at the Department of Justice, has left. He follows the White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum. As yet another shoe falls, it is hard to believe that this case doesn't have more legs than a centipede.

This most recent revelation raises more questions to the ever-lengthening list. By all accounts, Hubbell had a major role in running the Justice Department. Even before he was officially in place, he seemed to be the White House's chief contact and coordinator at Justice. He played a role in the firing of all 50 U.S. attorneys.

These are the same firings that have hindered investigations into alleged wrongdoings here in the House of Representatives.

Everywhere these actions are raising more questions, everywhere they are front-page news. For instance, today, USA Today's top story reads, "Clinton's Friend Quits Justice Job."

The Washington Times says, "Hubbell Resigns Post, Cites Distractions. His Rose law firm dealings remains under investigation."

The Washington Post today, "Hubbell Resigns at Justice in Rose Law Firm Dispute. Accused of Overbilling Clients, Improper Expenses." In the New York Times:

Senior Official Quits Justice Post as Pressure Rises. Ethics Are Questioned. Webster Hubbell, an old friend, leaves to spare the Clinton's further embarrassment.

Everywhere these issues are important—except in this institution. The problem seems to be that it is the wrong party calling for hearings and the wrong party being investigated. So scandal after scandal tiptoe past this sleeping watchdog. There was a House bank scandal. Then a House post office scandal. Then there was a new administration which immediately began adding to the list.

They started off with a scandal in the White House travel office. They have added the questionable handling of the suicide of a top White House aide. They have still left large numbers of their appointed posts unfilled. And we find large numbers of the appointees that are in place lack basic security clearances. Then of course, there is Whitewater. And the seemingly endless number of issues that it is spawning.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to read to you from an article by the gentleman from Iowa, Representative JIM LEACH, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:

In a nutshell, Whitewater is about the arrogance of power—political conflicts of interest that are self-evidently unseemly. It all began in the late 1970s when an S&L owner named James McDougal formed a 50-50 real estate venture with a young politician, the then-attorney general of Arkansas, Bill Clinton. In this venture called Whitewater, the S&L owner and S&L subsidiaries provided



virtually all, perhaps all, the money; the governor-in-the-making provided his name.

Over the years, the company received infusions of cash from the S&L as well as from a small business investment corporation that diverted, allegedly at the governor's request, federally guaranteed funds from a program designed for socially and economically disadvantaged people to the governor's partners and thence, in part, to Whitewater.

Some of these funds were used to pay off personal and campaign liabilities of the governor; some to purchase a tract of land from a company to which the state had just given a significant tax break. Whitewater records have apparently been largely lost. A review of the numerous land transactions, however, raises questions of what happened to the money that came into the company and a review of the president's tax records raises questions about tax deductions that were taken and taxes that were not paid.

It is no surprise that Special Counsel Robert Fiske, Jr. initiated March 4 a series of subpoenas reaching into the White House. What these subpoenas indicate is the movement of an investigation from possible illegal acts committed by a president prior to taking office to possible illegal actions committed in office. Obstruction of justice is now clearly at issue.

There are simply too many questions with too few answers.

The point of all this is that there is a disjunction in this administration between public policy and private ethics. Americans abhor privilege; hypocrisy gnaws at the American soul; it leaves a dispiriting residue of resentment.

Can, for instance, a president credibly rail against Michael Milken values if he has himself benefited from Milkenesque dealmaking?

Can a president credibly ask the people to pay taxes, let alone raise them, if he refuses to pay his own fair share?

Can a president credibly espouse open government if he applies a hide-and-seek standard to his own actions?

Can a president ask others to play by the rules—i.e., obey the law—if he doesn't play by them himself?

Can a president credibly advance an ethic of national service if his own model is one of self-service?

Can a president credibly advocate campaign reform if his own campaign has been sullied by illegal contributions from an S&L, which, with its failure, had the effect of causing deferred federal financing of a gubernatorial election?

Can a president credibly lead an ethical society if he doesn't set an ethical standard?

Despite all these questions, Congress has slept serenely in a shroud of secrecy. The same people who thought Whitewater not worthy of an independent counsel also cannot be troubled to hold even one hearing.

#### OFF AND RUNNING: A HEALTH RACE WITHOUT A WINNING HORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the great health care derby of 1994 is officially underway. This week the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health will begin formal consideration of the so-

called Stark bill, which media hand-cappers list as an unexpected early leader in the race to health reform. The frontrunner is not the much-ballyhooed one-time favorite known as Clinton health. But a no-name, dark horse bill which appeared from nowhere and is now judged to lead the pack.

□ 1050

In fact, Mr. Speaker, so new to the field is the proposal being offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] that Members who are considering the bill are not even sure how much it is going to cost unless they read the New York Times this morning, and I am not even sure the New York Times has the answer. I certainly do not. Most of the rest of us have not had a chance to see this bill, an opportunity to read the language. Is this the right way to start what is going to be the most consequential domestic policy debated in our time?

Mr. Speaker, health care reform involves nearly \$1 out of every \$7 spent in our economy, as we all know and comprehensive reform will literally affect each and every American in their daily lives. We ought to know what are doing. Yet despite more than year of planning, control of the Presidency, and a lock on both Houses of Congress—the Democratic Party is in such disarray over health reform that it has begun the legislative process by trotting out a completely new dark horse that we do not know anything about after reading the betting sheets on the Clinton plan recently, maybe this dark-horse strategy does make some sense, and I want to quote here now from an article taken this weekend by Donald Lambro out of one of the Washington papers on the 14th, and I quote:

The Washington Post's Jodie Allen asks: "Does anyone seriously believe this will work? Are the president and his wife, who declined to entrust the education of their child to their local government, really willing to let it take over the major role in deciding their health care options? Are you?"

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is clear. The Clinton thoroughbred has turned out to be a loser, and Americans by and large are rejecting it the more they know about it. Those who know a thing or two about health policy are running from the Clinton plan faster than the White House can crank out its press releases and spin-controlled media events, which go on as we speak, with prominent committee chairman suggesting that employer mandates, global budgets, and mandatory alliances are all but dead—there really is not much left of the President's bill to ride. It is time to put the fantastical wishes and bloated reality of the Clinton plan out of their misery once and for all. But rather than depend on another unknown, Government-dominated bill like that proposed by our colleague, the gentleman from Califor-

nia [Mr. STARK], it is time for the Congress to make the wise bet on reform ideas that have proven reliable and worthy of support in the past. For instance, we all know the value of simple insurance reforms that would end pre-existing condition exclusions and give Americans access to group-rated insurance guaranteed to be renewable and portable between jobs.

That is something we need, and we want, and we all know it. Let us attack costs and increase the accountability of those in the system by reforming our malpractice laws and cracking down on fraud and abuse in a meaningful way, not in the light touch that the Clinton plan put on it, and let us give individuals the power and incentive to seek out quality and preventive care by adopting medical savings accounts and taking advantage of individual deductions for health insurance costs. We can do this today—without all the posturing and rhetoric that has bogged down the reform process so far. Bills adopting these commonsense reforms have gained consensus support in both Houses and most even passed the Democratic Senate in the last Congress. It makes sense. These reforms would bring immediate relief to the majority of people who are without adequate coverage and who are waiting for us to act.

I do not think we should stake our future on a unknown, dark horse now when we have no better choices. We cannot afford to get so caught up in the politics of this issue that we end up losing the race for real and lasting reforms in order to bring home a winner, we need a health bill that builds on what works—and that has a broad-base of support, and we need those things.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to look again at H.R. 3080 and also at H.R. 3955, two bills which responsibly address the obvious problems with our system with carefully measured solutions. They provide workable answers for the cost crisis dominating our system—and they make access to affordable insurance possible without huge new taxes or bureaucracies. Those are good things. Let us get this race for reform off to a good start, and I think we want to start with a horse that we know is going to finish, not one we do not know about.

A lot has been said recently in the rhetoric about Whitewater, that Republicans are not doing their share. Well, let me tell my colleagues that two of the best bills out there, the Rowland-Bilirakis bill and the Cooper-Grandy bill that have been much discussed, and the Michel-Lott bill, all have significant Republican participation, so it is not fair, and it is not true to say that the Republicans are not positive contributors to the process of health care reform.

## WHITEWATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, yesterday the President of the United States said at a Democratic fund raiser in Boston—he decided to use the occasion to attack the Republican Party, and he attacked the Republican Party as the party of no—no to this and no to that—and he began to blame the Republican Party for his problems with regard to Whitewater.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the party of no, if he is calling the Republican Party the party of no because we are saying no to his health care reform that would socialize medicine, case rationing and put Government in charge of the Nation's health care, he is right. And if he is calling us the party of no because we do not want watered-down welfare reform that will not end welfare as we know it, that will do nothing more than expand the welfare state, he is right. And if he is saying that we are the party of no on the budget that called for higher taxes on American families, he is right. And if he is calling us the party of no on real crime reform; the bill that he supported last year would weaken the penalties against drug dealers, he is right, and it would have been legislative malpractice for Republicans to put aside our principles only to work with the party in power at the White House. But in each of these cases the Republican Party has met their duty as the opposition's party and have supported alternatives, real alternatives, to his programs.

In health care, Mr. Speaker, the Michel bill, supported by over 140 House Republicans is a bill that has more cosponsors with regard to health care than any other health care bill that has been entered. With regard to welfare reform, Mr. Speaker, the House Republican proposal was put together and introduced last September. The only comprehensive welfare reform bill to be put into the hopper in this session of Congress, it will promote work over dependency. It will take incentives that break up American families out of the current system. And with regard to the budget, Mr. Speaker, we have had a real budget alternative, not only last year, but again last week, for this year, and this year's version of the House Republican budget would give every American family a \$500 tax credit per child to help foster the families in America. It would also bring real reform of Government so that we can begin to meet the dream of all of us, a smaller, less costly, more effective Federal Government. And with regard to crime we have a real crime bill here in the House, one that will put more

cops on the streets, one that would build more prisons, one that would add tougher penalties and one that would put more money in to rehabilitate those prisoners that have a chance for rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, we stood together with the President last year for his toughest legislative victory, and that was over NAFTA. We put our partisan differences aside, and we stood toe and toe with the President to move NAFTA through this House. But it seems that the White House's strategy is emerging with regard to Whitewater, and that is just to blame Republicans.

Republicans were not involved in making Whitewater happen. Bill and Hillary Clinton, and their friends in Little Rock, caused Whitewater to occur. The media have been after this for over 2 years, and it is the media that is driving this.

Why? Because it has become clear to the media that the White House is not being forthcoming in delivering the facts to the American people. Neither was the Clinton campaign in 1992 when this issue first surfaced, and if, in fact, Mr. and Mrs. Clinton in 1992 would have put the facts forward, this issue may not still be here today.

But Congress has the responsibility in our Constitution, as elected by the people of this country, to provide oversight, oversight over Government, and Congress has a role in looking at this issue and bringing before the American people the facts.

Yes, there is a special prosecutor. We ought to allow him to do his job. The Congress also has another responsibility, and that is to also bring those facts before the American people. Mr. Fiske is looking at criminal activity. I think the American people want the Congress of the United States to hold the President to a higher standard than nothing more than criminal culpability. The President has a responsibility to stand above that, to be the moral authority of Government in our country. That is the role that Congress ought to be doing, is holding the President responsible for his conduct and activity, and we have a rightful role.

But more so, Mr. Speaker, let me say this:

The President himself and Mrs. Clinton should not have to endure this, nor should they require the American people to endure this. They could come forward today and lay the facts out on the table so that we in this country and our system of government are not jeopardized because we are going to allow the media and a special prosecutor to lay all of this out.

Put the facts before the American people, and end the sad day in our history.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair de-

clares the House in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 noon.

## PRAYER

Rabbi Aron Lieberman, Synagogue of Inverrary Chabad, Lauderhill, FL, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we beseech You to bless the Members of this august body, who represent the people of the United States of America. We ask also for Your blessings for our President Bill Clinton, and for the members of his cabinet. We pray that you guide this body in its task to protect and defend the welfare of the citizens of this great United States of America.

It is particularly fitting that we stand before you, Almighty God, on this the day when Members of the United States Congress and Senate join with representatives of the Lubavitch movement nationwide and here in Washington to celebrate the 92d birthday of the revered leader of the world Lubavitch movement, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson. The Lubavitch Rebbe has been an inspiration to many hundreds of thousands of people world-wide. Included among them Presidents, Members of Congress, international leaders, and heads of state, who have sought and received his advice and blessings.

The Rebbe now needs our prayers as he has suffered recently a second stroke and is in critical condition. Dear God, we pray that You allow all of us to join the many others in extending our prayers for a complete and speedy recovery to the Lubavitch Rebbe, Menachem Mendel Schneerson. It is in this spirit that we supplicate you, O God, to grant every Member of this Congress, good health, happiness, peace of mind and tranquility, and they be given the wisdom, understanding, and sensitivity to fulfill the important tasks bestowed upon them by the citizens of this great country.

Together, let us all answer this prayer with a resounding amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr.



BARTLETT] to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1926. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to modify the requirements relating to monthly reporting and staggered issuance of coupons for households residing on Indian reservations, to ensure adequate access to retail food stores by food stamp households, and to maintain the integrity of the food stamp program, and for other purposes.

#### WELCOME, RABBI ARON LIEBERMAN

(Mr. DEUTSCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to formally welcome Rabbi Aron Lieberman, of the Synagogue Inverrary Chabad, Lauderhill, FL, in my district, who joins us today both to offer the prayer at the start of the session but also to be here with the members of the Lubavitch movement from throughout the world celebrating both the rabbi's 92d birthday as well as education for all the children, not just in this country but throughout the world.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LADY MOUNTAINEERS OF MOUNT ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lady Mountaineers of Mount Saint Mary's College in beautiful Frederick County, MD, on their first ever appearance in the NCAA Division 1 Women's Basketball Tournament.

Since moving to division 1, 5 years ago, the Lady Mountaineers have compiled an impressive record with five straight regular season NEC championships. They have continued a tradition of excellence that has resulted in winning seasons in 18 of the last 20 years. Their hard work and determination paid off this year in an impressive 78 to 67 win over Saint Francis College to give them the NEC tournament championship. The Lady Mountaineers were led by Susie Rowlyk who scored 26 points and was named tournament MVP as well as NEC player of the year.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Lady Mountaineers excellence on the basketball court, these young women have proven a commitment to learning in the classroom by compiling a composite GPA that would place them on the dean's list.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish the Lady Mountaineers the best of luck in the tournament game against the Hawkeyes of Iowa, and congratulate them on a job well done.

#### LET US GET BACK TO HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans went off for a conference and studied to try to come up with a proposal for health care. After going to their camp for the weekend, they came away and they had nothing. There was nothing they could agree on as a health care reform package. And so I think what they decided to do at that point was go and come up with a new strategy, and that was to divert America's attention from health care and engage in "pillory Hillary." So that is what we have seen over and over again and over again.

When you think about it, imagine what would have happened if the Clintons had made money on this real estate deal.

Here is an example where we have a special prosecutor investigating it, you have a deal where they lost money, you have all sorts of other groups investigating it, and in the private sector as a private attorney dealing with many other things.

What in the world is going on here? I think this country has to get health care back in focus and we have to get moving on this issue, and let us stop all the distractions and pretending like every night's news show is an extension of "Gerald."

#### LET US KEEP ECONOMIC GROWTH ON TRACK

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the news just out this morning of slower than anticipated productivity and higher than expected inflation demonstrates that we need to do something to ensure that we keep economic growth on track.

Last December 15 we saw the completion of the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and most everyone has acknowledged that the economic growth that we have seen in this country has been led through exports.

That is why it is imperative that this Congress move ahead as expeditiously as possible to pass the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade so that we can ensure a higher level of productivity and a lower rate of inflation and a higher standard of living for people here in the United States of America and throughout the world.

#### NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, no one, not the President and not members of his family or staff, should be above the law. After the distressing Ames revelations and reports of mishandled documents in executive offices, Americans now learn that White House staff—some high-ranking—have neglected to obtain security clearances. Since this fact became public, we have been unable to get straightforward answers about the damage that may have been done, about the numbers of staff involved, about the risks that were taken with sensitive information. Questions are understandably being raised about why this routine, but vital clearance procedure is being circumvented at the White House. So far, we are told that staff just has not made the time to submit to the rules. This excuse begs two serious questions:

First, are the rules no longer important in this administration?

Or, second, what do these people have to hide? Americans deserve to know.

#### YES, YES, YES

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.

That is the Republican response to the President's tirade yesterday. Republicans want to work with the President to help this country. We want strong anticrime legislation. It is the liberal Democrats who say no. We want welfare reform. Again, the Democrats say no.

We want workable health care reform. The Democrats say no. We want a middle-class tax cut. The Democrats, no. We want hearings on Whitewater. The Democrats say no.

We want to pass the balanced budget amendment. Once again it is the Democrats who say no way.

Mr. Speaker, the President is way off base, and he knows it.

Republicans say yes, yes, yes. The Democrats say no, no, no.

#### NATIONAL ANGLER'S LICENSE

(Mr. ZIMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced legislation instructing the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to study the feasibility of a national angler's license.

Currently, anglers who fish along State borders must purchase more than one license to enjoy a day on the water. Vacationing fishermen often cannot afford to buy a license for every State in which they would like to fish.

A constituent of mine named Arnold Ropeik has suggested a common sense solution to this problem, a national angler's license. National license holders would be able to pay one fee to fish anywhere in the United States. Proceeds would be allocated so that no State would lose revenue.

The goal of my legislation is to make fishing as accessible as possible to both veteran anglers and new fishermen. This will result in more conservation funding, more private sector revenues from travel and tourism and more Americans enjoying the pleasures of fishing throughout this beautiful Nation.

□ 1210

#### DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING HOLIDAY COMMISSION

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, in the very early 1960's, when I was a student at Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA, I met a man who was a preacher from Montgomery, AL, Dr. Martin Luther King.

This man changed my life and the lives of millions of Americans who before "his dream" were treated as second-class citizens. After I met him, I enlisted in the movement and became one of Dr. King's foot soldiers in the war for racial equality. I was personally harassed by those who were against changes. It is hard for many of my colleagues to remember just how evil it was during the days of racial segregation before Dr. King helped change things, but, believe me, times were hard, cruel, and difficult. Because of my race, Mr. Speaker, none of Alabama's white public colleges would admit me as a student. We were cleverly denied the right to vote. Anyone would say, "If you travel after dark in many cities in Alabama," and I would say in the rural South, "as a black man, you took your life in your own hands," and, as many of my colleagues know, I am the first African-American since Reconstruction to be elected to the U.S. Congress by the people of Alabama.

It is not accidental that I am here. It is because we fought the struggle.

Times have changed. We have not reached the promised land. Without the continued presence, involvement and funding of the King Holiday Commission, Mr. Speaker, we would never reach our full potential of building both unity and understanding between the races.

Mr. Speaker, the past is history, but history must be treated as knowledge and in its proper perspective so that mistakes of the past will be known so that hopefully they will be prevented and corrected. The Martin Luther King Holiday Commission helps us to remember. Hopefully it will help us to correct and prevent mistakes of the past.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE SOME ANSWERS

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, members of the Clinton administration and high officials in the Democratic National Committee all insist that there is no scandal. I beg to differ. The scandal is that 80 percent, 80 percent of the State chartered S&L's in Arkansas, failed. Could it be that there were some good old boys, regulators, who were asleep at the switch? I do not know the answer, but I do know that the American people deserve the answers, and I do know that the Arkansas State government did not pay a dime to bail out those institutions. Taxpayers from across the country from States like my own, from Wisconsin, did. The incredible mismanagement of Madison Guarantee cost the American taxpayers alone in that one S&L \$60 million.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing to hide is there such a resistance to congressional hearings? The American people have legitimate questions about this administration, Mr. Speaker, and it is time that we get some straight answers for a change. Let us go on with the hearings. Let us clear the air so we can get on with our Nation's business. We have got a lot of issues to address, and we have got to be addressing those.

President Nixon was not above the law. President Clinton cannot be above the law either. No American can be above the law.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, March 16, 1994.

#### KING HOLIDAY AND SERVICE ACT OF 1994

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1933) to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, to extend such Commission, and to support the planning and performance of national service opportunities in conjunction with the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1933

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "King Holiday and Service Act of 1994".

#### SEC. 2. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION.

The Act entitled "An Act to establish a commission to assist in the first observance of the Federal legal holiday honoring Martin Luther King, Jr.", approved August 27, 1984 (36 U.S.C. 169j and following) is amended—

(1) in section 3(1) by inserting "(including service opportunities)" after "activities";

(2) in section 4(a) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting "and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(7) the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, appointed under section 193 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12651c).";

(3) in section 6(a) by striking "maximum rate of pay payable for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332" and inserting "rate of pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315";

(4) by amending section 7 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

"(1) \$300,000 for fiscal year 1995;

"(2) \$350,000 for fiscal year 1996;

"(2) \$400,000 for fiscal year 1997;

"(2) \$450,000 for fiscal year 1998; and

"(2) \$500,000 for fiscal year 1999.";

(5) in section 8 by inserting after "under this Act" the following: "or under the National and Community Service Act of 1990"; and

(6) in section 9 by striking "April 20, 1994" and inserting "September 30, 1999".

#### SEC. 3. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., SERVICE DAY.

(a) ADDITIONAL CORPORATION ACTIVITY TO SUPPORT NATIONAL SERVICE.—Section 198 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12653) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(s) MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., SERVICE DAY.—

"(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Corporation may make grants to eligible entities described in paragraph (2) to pay for the Federal share of the cost of planning and carrying out service opportunities in conjunction with the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. Such service opportunities shall consist of activities reflecting the life and teachings of Martin Luther King, Jr., such as cooperation and understanding among racial and ethnic groups, nonviolent conflict resolution, equal economic and educational opportunities, and social justice.

"(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Any entity otherwise eligible for assistance under the na-



tional services laws shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

"(3) CONSULTATION.—In making grants under this subsection, the Corporation shall consult with the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission established under section 2 of Public Law 98-399 (36 U.S.C. 169j-1).

"(4) FEDERAL SHARE.—Grants provided under this subsection to an eligible entity to support the planning and carrying out of a service opportunity in conjunction with the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., together with all other Federal funds used to plan or carry out the service opportunity, may not exceed 30 percent of the cost of planning and carrying out the service opportunity.

"(5) CALCULATION OF ENTITY CONTRIBUTIONS.—In determining the non-Federal share of the costs of planning and carrying out a service opportunity supported by a grant under this subsection, the Corporation shall consider in-kind contributions (including facilities, equipment, and services) made to plan or carry out the service opportunity."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REFERENCE TO REPEALED SECTION.—Section 101(a)(3) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 788) is amended by striking "through 136" and inserting "through 135".

(2) INCORRECT REFERENCE TO ACT.—Section 203(a)(3) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 891) is amended by striking "Act of 1993" and inserting "Act of 1990".

(3) DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SERVICE PARTICIPANTS.—Section 137(c) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12591(c)), as added by section 101(b) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 809), is amended by striking "subsection (a)(5)(A)" and inserting "subsection (a)(5)".

(4) EDUCATIONAL AWARD ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 146(a) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12602(a)), as added by section 102(a) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 818), is amended by striking the second paragraph (3).

(5) CIVILIAN COMMUNITY CORPS.—

(A) USE OF INCORRECT TERM.—Section 155(e) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12615(e)), as redesignated by section 104(b)(3) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 840), is amended by striking "CORPS" and inserting "CAMPS".

(B) REFERENCE TO SECTION.—Subsection (C)(2)(C)(i) of section 159 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12619), as amended by section 104(e)(2)(E)(ii) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 847), is amended by striking "section 162(a)(2)" and inserting "section 162(a)(2)".

(C) CROSS REFERENCE.—Section 162(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12622(a)(1)(B)(ii)), as redesignated by section 104(b)(3) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 840), is amended by striking "section 4462 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993" and inserting "section 1143a of title 10, United States Code".

(6) PUNCTUATION.—Section 198(q)(1) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990

(42 U.S.C. 12653(q)(1)), as added by section 104(c) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 840), is amended by striking "1995" and inserting "1995."

(7) REDESIGNATED PARAGRAPH.—Subsection (b)(6) of section 103 of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4953), as redesignated by section 323(b)(3) of the National and Community Service Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 900), is amended by striking "(6)" and inserting "(5)".

(8) SUBPARAGRAPH INDENTATION.—Subsection (c)(1)(F) of section 103 of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4953), as amended by section 323(c)(1)(D) of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-82; 107 Stat. 900), is amended by moving the left margin two ems to the left.

(9) CORRECT EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT.—Section 224 of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 5024) is amended by striking "volunteer projects for older Americans" and inserting "National Senior Volunteer Corps projects".

(10) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall take effect as of October 1, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring the King Holiday and Service Act before the House. I want to commend the bill's chief sponsor, my good friend from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, for his dedication to keeping Dr. King's dream alive.

I also want to recognize the work of Congressman RALPH REGULA, who is the Vice Chairman of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, and to thank him for his guidance and assistance.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman BILL CLAY, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and Congressman BILL FORD, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, for their efforts in getting this measure to the floor today.

H.R. 1933 would extend the life of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission and authorize an annual appropriation for its operation. It also broadens the Commission's legislative mandate to make the promotion of community service opportunities an explicit part of the Commission's purpose.

As a member of the Commission since 1989, I have firsthand knowledge of its worthwhile activities. I believe that all Americans will benefit enormously if the Commission's work continues.

Thanks to the tireless efforts of the Commission, all 50 States recognized Dr. King's birthday with a paid holiday this year. Despite that work, however, many continue to perceive the King holiday as a holiday for black Americans alone.

Only 18 percent of private sector employers observe the occasion. Dr. King did not represent one segment of our population. He worked to ensure equality of opportunity for all Americans. Clearly, more work is needed to ensure that this holiday is truly inclusive and meaningful, as it was intended to be.

The Commission devotes considerable time and resources to promoting racial harmony and understanding through the holiday, at a time when our Nation is becoming more diverse. Equally important, with its limited resources, the Commission uses the holiday to focus attention on community involvement, and efforts to combat violence, crime, drugs, and illiteracy, as well as the importance of voter registration and urban economic development.

While the Commission sponsors activities throughout the year, it is the Federal holiday that casts the necessary light on the continued importance of Dr. King's legacy to so many facets of our lives today. I believe that the Commission is a modest investment for the Federal Government to make in bridging the often wide gap between people of different races and cultures that threatens both social and economic progress in our country.

Dr. King left our Nation, and the world, a legacy that is priceless. Surely, passage of H.R. 1933 is not too high a price to pay to hold on to that dream.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1933 has 3 major provisions.

First, the bill extends the life of the Commission for 5 years, through fiscal year 1999. We all agree that the Commission has accomplished a great deal since its inception. However, there is still a lot of work ahead if we want the King holiday to be a point from which we can educate all Americans about Dr. King's philosophy and contributions to our progress as a Nation. Extending the life of the Commission will allow it to accomplish that important goal.

Second, the bill authorizes \$300,000 for fiscal year 1995; and increases that amount by a modest \$50,000 each year through fiscal year 1999.

Third, H.R. 1933 authorizes the Corporation for National and Community Service to make grants for planning and carrying out community service opportunities in conjunction with the King holiday. The bill limits the Federal share of any such grants to 30 percent of the funds used to plan and carry out those activities.

I know that some of my colleagues are concerned that the extension of the King Commission represents a personal

benefit to Mrs. King and her family. While I understand that concern, I think it is wrong and unfounded.

Dr. King's legacy transcends his family. Neither Mrs. King nor any of her children are employees of the Commission. Their service on the Commission is borne out of a commitment to their country and its future well-being.

The work of the King Commission provides us with an opportunity to renew our commitment to Dr. King's dream. Americans of all races and ethnic backgrounds are entitled to share in the challenge of economic recovery and social healing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Vice Chairman of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission. It has been my real privilege to serve with many fine and dedicated individuals on this Commission and especially with my friend Coretta Scott King.

One of the reasons that I support the King Holiday is that Dr. King was largely responsible for leading our society through the upheavals we faced in the 1960's with the doctrine of nonviolence as his banner. We are affirming that nonviolence is the honorable way to promote change in our society.

I support the extension of this Commission because this is an unusual Federal holiday; this holiday is more than a day off. We honor Dr. King by setting aside this day to serve other people—to work on behalf of people who are less fortunate than ourselves.

Thus, the legislation to reauthorize the King Holiday is designed to transform the observance of Dr. King's birthday into a national day of service. It is not enough to write laws that punish people for criminal behavior. It is not enough to prohibit certain actions and to criticize people for hurting others. We must act positively—help people find ways to work within the community, to support each other and to keep busy helping others.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that historically the King Commission has worked on the education program, and now the focus has shifted to one of community service to encourage young people in the communities around the United States to work with each other and to work with the institutions to improve the quality of life, and that is the real way in which we will solve many of the problems of our urban society. According to Martin Luther King, Jr.:

Peace is not merely the absence of some negative force, it is the presence of a positive

force. True peace is not merely the absence of tension, but it is the presence of justice and brotherhood.

Those are certainly words we should all live by. While we are engaged in a national debate on crime and safety—I hope that we can consider the value of encouraging positive forces and activities in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members to join me in voting to reauthorize the King Holiday Commission and to continue its great work under the leadership of Coretta Scott King that has been accomplished thus far and that will take place likewise in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD], whose 1-minute speech preceded this debate.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King was truly an American. He was a loyal American. He took the difficult side. He took the dark side and brought light to it. He enlightened all of America on the evils. He enlightened all of America on the worst part of our system. But he also moved to correct the evil, to shed not only light but to bring those evils to the forefront and to terminate them and eradicate them from our society. During his lifetime he was only partially successful in doing this. It is up to the rest of us to continue his good work. To reauthorize this act means that we reaffirm what he had started. It means that we wish to continue what he has done. It means that we wish to continue to strengthen democracy. His legacy proves to us that it was needed. To remember him is to improve on that legacy. As we look at our society, all those things that are good and all those things that we wish to preserve, we often think of our heroes and what they have done to improve the past.

Mr. Speaker, this is one hero whose legacy we must preserve. We must preserve what he started. We must continue to improve on it. And we do that when we reauthorize the act that set his date as a national holiday. It is not a day just to remember him but is a day to be joyful that a man of his caliber came along and set the record straight and changed America.

It was his desire to do good. It ought to be our desire to continue goodness.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1933. While I by no means question the past important and successful work of the Commission, I feel its work is complete. We cannot and should not authorize the use of taxpayers' funds for the continuation of a commission that has done its job. All 50 States, the District of Columbia and the Federal Government now commemorate Dr. King's birthday and his legacy with a paid holiday.

President's Day, Independence Day, Memorial Day, Veterans' Day, and other public holidays, all of which serve as equally important reminders of our national heritage, do not have a holiday commission. There is no precedent for a commission of this type, much less the appropriation of Federal funds for its operation. No other Federal holiday has ever had anything similar.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1933 completely changes the original legislative purpose of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Commission, which was charged only with assisting in the first observance of the Federal legal holiday honoring Dr. King and his legacy. It was to sunset in 2 years and was not to receive any Federal funds. It was only after the second extension in 1989 that the Commission began receiving Federal dollars.

H.R. 1933 would permit the Commission to become involved in a number of activities which are totally unrelated to its original mandate.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission's justification in requesting an extension is that it believes there is a need to continue promoting Dr. King's ideals of community service, racial harmony and economic opportunity. While I in no way question the importance of these activities, they are not related to the original legislative mandate of the Commission. Many Members of Congress supported establishing the Commission because it was not to become a permanent structure and was to be funded only by private donations.

Those who support H.R. 1933 to extend the life of the Commission and its appropriations contend that the Commission would be in a position to encourage and sponsor more activities aimed at combating violence, crime, drugs and illiteracy as well as promoting voter registration and urban economic development.

I feel that our Federal, State and local governments, along with hundreds of private and professional organizations, presently have outreach programs similar to those programs and activities which the Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday Commission is now seeking to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, rather than declaring victory and closing down, the Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday Commission is searching out new programs and activities to justify its existence.

Martin Luther King, Jr. has a special honored place in our history and the heart of the Nation. All 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Federal Government, and many foreign countries now celebrate and honor Dr. King's legacy and ideals of nonviolence and social change. The Commission has successfully completed its congressional mandate. It is time we terminate the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.



□ 1230

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1933, which will, among other things, extend the life of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission to September 30, 1999. The Congress must not be silent on this extension.

H.R. 1933, through its provisions, will bring focus and understanding on the life and the teachings of Dr. King. In doing so, it seeks to ensure the continuity and universal acceptance of one day of commemoration. That day commemorates one man who, more than any other, symbolizes the sometimes painful and frequently painfully slow embodiment of Judeo-Christian racial justice in 20th Century American society.

There are many—many of all races—who feel that the freedoms dreamed and sought by the Reverend King are as significant to every American as were the freedoms sought by the American Revolution. The strength and acceptance of those freedoms—the freedoms that accompany equality—will grow with each generation, unless we allow them to atrophy. If we do allow our commitment to those freedoms to diminish, we as a nation become equally diminished. The objectives sought by H.R. 1933 are those that will pass to our children the common hope, shared by all Americans, in the emergence of a society of harmony, equality, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will be the pleasure of each and every one of my colleagues to join me in passing this bill.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuation of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday Commission. There are those who would say this commission is no longer necessary because we now celebrate the King holiday nationwide.

But, one needs only listen to the daily news, and read the headlines to know that we need this commission, now more than ever.

Our young people are dying in great numbers on the streets, in their classrooms, and in their homes, from violent acts, Mr. Speaker. That is a fact. And the most frightening thing about that fact is—our children are killing each other.

The King Holiday Commission is dedicated to teaching the tenants of nonviolence, and the value of community service to our young people. Children who are taught to respect the sanctity of life and to serve their fellow human beings, do not commit acts of random violence.

There was a time when the entire community accepted responsibility for

teaching the young, that is no longer the case.

We also have to acknowledge that there are many children who come from dysfunctional families, families that do not offer them the kind of support they need to become productive citizens.

We should not abandon these young people, Mr. Speaker. We should empower them with the tools they need to grow up safe, well and happy.

We need to teach them to hold high the banner of nonviolence. The King Holiday Commission will ensure that we make the teaching of nonviolence a national priority. It will reinforce the words of Dr. King, who said:

Non-violence is a powerful and just weapon. It is a weapon unique in history, which cuts without wounding and ennobles the man who wields it. It is a sword that heals.

Let us empower our young people to save their own lives. Let us empower them with the tools of nonviolence and community service. Mr. Speaker, we have at our disposal the Martin Luther King Holiday Commission, an organization that is ready, willing and able to carry out this mission.

Let us give them the financial resources they need to be successful. I can think of no better investment than the lives of our children.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the chief sponsor of the measure before us.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], for yielding. The gentleman from Ohio is more than a cosponsor, but a wholehearted sponsor and supporter of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of a very important piece of legislation which I have introduced in the House and which Senator HARRIS WOFFORD has introduced in the Senate, the King Holiday and Service Act of 1993.

In 1963, Dr. King said that, "violence is the voice of the unheard." These are still important words today.

I ask my colleagues, how can we ask our children to call upon their inner strength if we do not teach them to recognize the value of their own souls? How will our children resolve conflicts if the greatest strength they know is a gun or a knife in their hand? How will we justify our negligence if we do not make an active effort to pass the teachings of Dr. King on to our children?

We must use every resource to show our children that they can work together and that together they can achieve a common good, a higher good.

The Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission has made important inroads. When the Commission began its work, only 17 States celebrated the King holiday. Now, Dr.

King's birthday is celebrated in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and more than 100 nations.

When the Commission began its work, many of the children now involved in Commission activities spent their free time in the streets. Now, the Commission has enlisted over 27,000 youth in "Youth Against Violence Symposiums." The Commission has recruited 4 million young people to sign a pledge committing themselves to a life of nonviolence. And the Commission has brought together 1,000 youth leaders at youth assemblies that address major social problems such as drug abuse and illiteracy.

I believe we can do more. We must.

Today, some 100,000 students take guns to school every day. Another 160,000 stay home out of fear of violence at school. We are still a society divided by race and class. Our cities and our schools have become centers of crime and violence. They have become places of despair.

Dr. King's method was love. His weapon was truth. And his goal was the "Beloved Community"—a community based on justice, a community at peace.

Dr. King could speak and the masses understood from his words that they were somebody. He was a spokesman not only for one race, but for human beings of every kind.

□ 1240

We no longer hear his voice, but we still hear his words. We can no longer take part in his actions, but we can take actions of our own. We must not allow the King holiday to become a day of nothing in particular—a day of shopping, a day of recreating. We must make the holiday a day of action, for ourselves and for our children.

One of the most important things I tell young people today is that you must believe in the possibility for positive change. I have always had a firm belief in the idea that people of good will can work together and bring about positive change. But, change takes effort. Change takes organization.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission is a tremendous and important source of this effort.

It is a tremendous and important source of organization for the cause of peace, for the cause of nonviolence, for the cause of building a sense of family, a sense of community. I believe we can make a little sacrifice; we can afford a little effort to make the lives of our children better today and tomorrow. We can afford a little effort to involve our children in nonviolent activity and esteem-building activities such as a community service.

We must allow the important work of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission to continue. I believe with the King Holiday Commission, we will witness in our country in

the days to come a nonviolent revolution, a revolution of values, a revolution of ideas that we will create a sense of community. We will create a sense of family. We will create America's house.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1933, the King Holiday Service Act of 1994. Ten years after the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission was established to institutionalize the holiday marking the birth of Dr. King and to encourage appropriate activities celebrating his life, all 50 States officially observe the King holiday. However, few private employers observe the holiday and many people continue to perceive the King holiday as an event for African-Americans alone.

Clearly, more must be done to ensure that this holiday is as meaningful and inclusive as it is intended to be. One way in which the Commission continues to work toward this objective is advancing community service opportunities which promote nonviolence, racial cooperation and understanding, and social justice. H.R. 1933 authorizes the Corporation for National and Community Service to make grants for service activities which promote Dr. King's timeless ideals of community service and racial harmony, and are a fitting tribute to his life. In his own words delivered in a June 1961 commencement address entitled "The American Dream" Dr. King said:

\*\*\* We have made of this world a neighborhood; now \*\*\* we must make of it a brotherhood \*\*\* we must all learn to live together as brothers or we will perish together as fools. We must come to see that no individual can live alone \*\*\* we must all live together; we must all be concerned about one another.

I would like to add that I am particularly proud of the Martin Luther King Commission in my district in Brooklyn. As our diverse Nation continues to struggle with acts of racism and violence, the Commission in Brooklyn sponsors activities to promote Dr. King's teachings. This Commission recognizes the achievements of talented and thoughtful young people who, through creative essays and artwork, reflect on Dr. King's life. It is only if every successive generation of youth fully embrace Dr. King's ideals that we will achieve his dream of a nation that will "rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed—that all men are created equal," a nation where people are judged "by the content of their character, not by the color of their skin."

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I pause only to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for raising the kinds of questions which he has raised in so thoughtful a manner. They are the kinds of questions that ought to be raised by any measure of this kind as it comes before us.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the bill to extend the life of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission to September 30, 1999.

Although it has been over two decades since Dr. King was laid to rest, his spirit is very much with us today. His challenge to people of all races to embrace justice, equality and nonviolence is more relevant today than ever.

Our society still has a long way to go in overcoming obstacles and achieving the racial harmony envisioned by Dr. King.

When we have a school principal in Alabama telling a child her birth was a mistake because her parents are of different races, we have really not come very far in heeding Dr. King's message of tolerance and acceptance.

I feel privileged to have known Dr. King personally. About a week before his untimely death, Dr. King visited New Jersey to mobilize support for a cause that was important to him—the Poor People's Campaign. I spent some time with him that day as he spoke to students at a local high school and to a congregation at a local church.

I am proud that in my hometown of Newark we have now dedicated the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Building in honor of this great leader.

It is important that we as a nation keep Dr. King's dream alive. The bill we are considering today accomplished that goal in a number of ways. In addition to allowing the Commission to continue its work in addressing violence, crime, drug abuse and illiteracy, the measure also allows the Corporation on National and Community Service to make grants available to help with planning national service programs held in conjunction with the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this extension to allow the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission to continue its important work.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1933, to extend the authorization for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission. I want to commend my colleagues, Representative JOHN LEWIS and Representative TOM SAWYER for bringing this bill to the floor today.

The Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday Commission was established in 1984 to encourage appropriate celebrations and events relating to the observance of the Federal holiday in honor of Dr. King. The Commission has been extended twice previously and its current authorization is set to expire on April 20, 1994. It is imperative that we act quickly to extend the authorization for the Commission through September 30, 1999, to continue promotion of Dr. King's ideals of racial harmony, economic opportunity for all, and process through non-violent social change.

Mr. Chairman, this year all 50 States recognized Dr. King's birthday with a paid holiday.

However, many Americans continue to perceive the King holiday solely as an African-American holiday, without relevance or meaning for other Americans. As a result, unfortunately, only 18 percent of private employers grant their employees a paid holiday in observance of the King birthday holiday. This is a tragedy and a manifest dishonor to the memory of a man who devoted his life to inclusion and opportunity for all. As a nation, we can do better to celebrate Dr. King's legacy.

H.R. 1933 extends the life of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission for an additional 5 years, and authorizes appropriations for the Commission's work. With the limited resources provided to the Commission, it uses the holiday as a focal point for promoting activities aimed at community service; for combating violence, crime, drugs, and illiteracy; and for encouraging voter registration and urban economic development. We need to extend the life of the Commission to enable it to further develop programs to enhance the celebration of Dr. King's birthday, and spread his message of freedom, equality, and the dignity of man to every American.

Mr. Chairman, at a time in our Nation when the public is crying out for solutions to a rising tide of social problems, these timeless truths professed by Dr. King are more relevant than ever. Every one of us should be very proud of the legacy of service to one's fellow man left by Dr. King. Our National Government needs to actively promote these ideals to our young people, and to people all over the world. Extending the life of the King Federal Holiday Commission will greatly enhance the ability of the Federal Government to promote these ideals. I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1933.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1933, the King Holiday and Service Act of 1933. I have been a cosponsor of this legislation since April 29, 1993, when it was introduced by my colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS of Georgia. H.R. 1933 would extend the life of the King Commission and make the King holiday a "national service day to promote community service." The King holiday would allow all Americans to open their hearts and offer their skills to improve the quality of life for themselves and others through community service and interracial harmony. It would seek to challenge every American to take voluntary actions to wipe out some of our pressing social problems.

This holiday is special in the history of our Nation in that it challenges every person to make a difference in someone's life. It encourages all of us to face the future with strength and an understanding to work for a better Nation and a better world. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1933 and I sincerely believe in the Commission's goals to promote equality and human dignity for all people.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill, H.R. 1933, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). Is there objection



to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1933, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission, to extend such Commission, and to support the planning and performance of national service opportunities in conjunction with the Federal legal holiday honoring the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY CERTAIN COMMITTEES IN SECOND SESSION OF 103D CONGRESS

Mr. FROST, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-433) on the resolution (H. Res. 369) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by certain committees of the House in the 2d session of the 103d Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY CERTAIN COMMITTEES FROM APRIL 1, 1994, THROUGH MAY 31, 1994

Mr. FROST, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-434) on the resolution (H. Res. 387) providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by certain committees of the House from April 1, 1994, through May 31, 1994, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### RIO GRANDE DESIGNATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 375) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Rio Grande in New Mexico as a component of the National Wild

and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 375

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rio Grande Designation Act of 1994".

#### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF SCENIC RIVER.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"( ) RIO GRANDE, NEW MEXICO.—The main stem from the southern boundary of the segment of the Rio Grande designated pursuant to paragraph (4), downstream approximately 12 miles to the west section line of Section 15, Township 23 North, Range 10 East, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river."

#### SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF STUDY RIVER.

(a) STUDY.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

"( ) RIO GRANDE, NEW MEXICO.—The segment from the west section line of Section 15, Township 23 North, Range 10 East, downstream approximately 8 miles to the southern line of the northwest quarter of Section 34, Township 23 North, Range 9 East."

(b) STUDY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"( ) The study of the Rio Grande in New Mexico shall be completed and the report submitted not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph."

#### SEC. 4. RIO GRANDE CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall take appropriate steps to obtain the views of the residents of the village of Pilar and of those persons who are the owners of property adjoining the river segments described in sections 2 and 3 concerning implementation of this Act, and to assure that those views will be considered in connection with preparation of a comprehensive management plan for the segment designated by section 2 and the study required by section 3.

#### SEC. 5. WITHDRAWAL OF ORILLA VERDE RECREATION AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the lands described in subsection (b) are withdrawn from—

- (1) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing.

#### (b) LANDS.—

(1) DESCRIPTION.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) comprise an area known as the "Orilla Verde Recreation Area", including—

(A) approximately 1,349 acres which were conveyed to the United States by the State of New Mexico on July 23, 1980, April 20, 1990, and July 17, 1990; and

(B) an additional 4,339 acres of public lands, all as generally depicted on the map entitled "Orilla Verde Recreation Area, New Mexico", and dated February, 1994.

(2) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

#### SEC. 6. COMPLETION OF PREHISTORIC TRACKWAYS STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with the Smithsonian Institution for the completion of the prehistoric trackways study required under section 303 of the Act entitled "An Act to conduct certain studies in the State of New Mexico", approved November 15, 1990 (Public Law 101-578).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the legislation now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 375 deals with two segments of the Rio Grande River, in northern New Mexico. It is similar to a companion bill introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The Rio Grande is the fifth-longest river in North America and one of the great rivers of the Southwestern United States. It rises in southwestern Colorado and continues for more than 1,800 miles through Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas before reaching the Gulf of Mexico. From El Paso to Brownsville, it marks our Nation's boundary with Mexico.

A segment of the Rio Grande immediately south of the Colorado-New Mexico boundary was included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System when that system was first established by enactment of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The two Rio Grande River segments covered by this bill are immediately downstream from that already-designated segment and are in a part of New Mexico increasingly popular for recreational uses, including river rafting.

Under the bill, one segment of 12 miles would be added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to be managed as a scenic river under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Another segment, covering an additional 8 miles, would be required to be studied for possible future designation, with a report on the results of the study required to be submitted within 3 years after enactment.

Both segments are bordered by extensive tracts of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management [BLM], which will be responsible for

managing the designated segment and for conducting the study. The designated segment is becoming increasingly popular for recreation, which of course would continue after designation but which BLM would manage to emphasize protection of the biological and other resources of the area.

The bill would also withdraw the public lands in an area known as the 5,600-acre Orilla Verde Recreation Area from disposal under the public land laws, from mineral entry under the mining laws, and from operation of the mineral and geothermal leasing laws, and would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Smithsonian Institution for completion of a study of prehistoric track ways required under section 303 of Public Law 101-578.

In amending this bill, Mr. Speaker, the committee dropped the Senate's provision for a new advisory body consisting only of a village representative and a specified number of local landowners. Instead, we have substituted a requirement that the BLM Act to obtain local views and to give those views appropriate consideration in connection with the development of the management plan for the designated segment and in connection with the study of the other segment. We understand that BLM may well do this through establishment of a task force or working group, including the parties that would have been included on the statutory body provided for in the original Senate bill.

We believe that instead of requiring the establishment of another permanent statutory body, it is better in this case to give more flexibility to the BLM on ways to assure that the villagers and landowners be actively involved in future decisions about these areas.

The committee also increased the acreage of the adjacent public lands withdrawn from mineral entry and mineral geothermal leasing, as suggested by the administration, to reflect the current total area BLM wants to manage for recreational uses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for his hard work and leadership on this matter. With his help, the committee has been able to further improve the bill, and I urge its approval by the House.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 375 which, among other things, would designate a segment of the upper Rio Grande River in New Mexico as an addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

This legislation, which was introduced by Senator BINGAMAN and has al-

ready passed the other body, has been explained in detail by Chairman VENTO. Its major provisions would add a 12-mile segment of the Rio Grande to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System and authorize an additional 8-mile segment be studied for possible future designation.

Although this bill was amended in the House Natural Resources Committee, I understand it is still supported by the two New Mexico Senators, not to mention Mr. RICHARDSON, who has worked hard on this issue in the Natural Resources Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 375.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] the principal sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for their very generous remarks. This is an important bill for New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to support S. 375, the Senate version of legislation I introduced (H.R. 1471) to grant wild and scenic river designation to a 12-mile segment of the Rio Grande in my district in New Mexico and study another 8 miles for possible inclusion in the future. I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, Chairman VENTO, and the Natural Resources Committee staff for their cooperation in moving this legislation through the committee and to the House floor today. I would also like to commend Senator JEFF BINGAMAN for introducing the Senate version of my legislation, which is the bill we are now considering.

In bringing this bill to the House floor today, my staff has worked with those of Senator BINGAMAN, the staff of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Bureau of Land Management, private landowners in the area near the affected segment and local river protection groups such as Amigos Bravos in crafting a final product that will confer protection on the river and recognize the unique character of this beautiful river.

The Rio Grande was one of the first rivers protected under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act when it became law in 1968. S. 375 would confer this designation on an additional stretch of river downstream from the Taos Junction Bridge to the Village of Rinconada and require a study of the next 8 downstream miles for future designation. I hope that we can pass legislation to address these additional miles soon as well.

As a westerner, I have a special understanding of the importance of water to the daily lives of my constituents.

In New Mexico, water really is life, and the Rio Grande is truly connected to all of our lives. The segment we will designate today is an especially beautiful stretch of river with multiple scenic views and a history of relatively undisturbed natural beauty. In recent years, however, the same qualities that make this river so valuable are threatening the future health of the river.

This bill will provide protection of this river segment from any federally built, permitted or licensed dam or other water resource project which would have a direct and adverse effect on the river. But designation will also signal that while we value the many wonderful uses of the river, we must realize that protection and preservation of this natural resource should be our ultimate goal. The prestigious national river protection group American Rivers named the Rio Grande the most endangered river in America in 1993. While S. 375 would only affect a small portion of this great American treasure, it will ensure that future generations can enjoy the beauty that is the natural heritage of New Mexico without the deleterious effects of development or overuse. Future generations deserve no less.

I am pleased to recommend this bill to my colleagues in the House today, and I look forward to its enactment into law in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and the gentleman from California, as well as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and many others who have been active in important environmental legislation in the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON]. These riverine systems are very important for watershed protection. The recognition of this as being a very endangered river is a positive step forward. There is much more to be done. There is more study provided. There is more action by this Congress necessary to protect these great riverine systems. This bill is a positive step, and I urge support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 375, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



# FARMINGTON WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2815) to designate a portion of the Farmington River in Connecticut as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2815

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Farmington Wild and Scenic River Act".

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Public Law 99-590 authorized the study of 2 segments of the West Branch of the Farmington River, including an 11-mile headwater segment in Massachusetts and the uppermost 14-mile segment in Connecticut, for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and created the Farmington River Study Committee, consisting of representatives from the 2 States, the towns bordering the 2 segments, and other river interests, to advise the Secretary of the Interior in conducting the study and concerning management alternatives should the river be included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

(2) the study determined that both segments of the river are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System based upon their free-flowing condition and outstanding fisheries, recreation, wildlife, and historic values;

(3) the towns that directly abut the Connecticut segment (Hartland, Barkhamsted, New Hartford, and Canton), as well as the Town of Colebrook, which abuts the segment's major tributary have demonstrated their desire for national wild and scenic river designation through town meeting actions endorsing designations; in addition, the 4 abutting towns have demonstrated their commitment to protect the river through the adoption of "river protection overlay districts," which establish a uniform setback for new structures, new septic systems, sand and gravel extraction, and vegetation removal along the entire length of the Connecticut segment;

(4) during the study, the Farmington River Study Committee and the National Park Service prepared a comprehensive management plan for the Connecticut segment (the "Upper Farmington River Management Plan", dated April 29, 1993) which establishes objectives, standards, and action programs that will ensure long-term protection of the river's outstanding values and compatible management of its land and water resources, without Federal management of affected lands not owned by the United States;

(5) the Farmington River Study Committee voted unanimously on April 29, 1993, to adopt the Upper Farmington River Management Plan and to recommend that Congress include the Connecticut segment in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in accordance with the spirit and provisions of the Upper Farmington River Management Plan, and to recommend that, in the absence of town votes supporting designation, no action be taken regarding wild and scenic river designation of the Massachusetts segment; and

(6) the Colebrook Dam and Goodwin Dam hydroelectric projects are located outside

the river segment designated by section 3, and the study of the Farmington River pursuant to Public Law 99-590 determined that continuation of existing operations of these projects as presently configured, together with associated transmission lines and other existing project works, is not incompatible with the designation made by section 3 and will not unreasonably diminish the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values of the segment designated by such section as of the date of enactment of this Act; therefore, section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act will not preclude the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from licensing or relicensing (or exempting from licensing) the continued operations of such projects as presently configured or with changes in configuration that the Secretary determines would be consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Plan.

## SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"( ) FARMINGTON RIVER, CONNECTICUT.—The 14-mile segment of the West Branch and mainstem extending from immediately below the Goodwin Dam and Hydro-electric Project in Hartland, Connecticut, to the downstream end of the New Hartford-Canton, Connecticut, town line (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'segment'), as a recreational river, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through cooperative agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Connecticut and its relevant political subdivisions, namely the Towns of Colebrook, Hartland, Barkhamsted, New Hartford, and Canton and the Hartford Metropolitan District Commission, pursuant to section 10(e) of this Act. The segment shall be managed in accordance with the Upper Farmington River Management Plan, dated April 29, 1993, and such amendments thereto as the Secretary of the Interior determines are consistent with this Act. Such plan shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement for a comprehensive management plan pursuant to section 3(d) of this Act."

## SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT.

(a) COMMITTEE.—The Director shall appoint a person to represent the Secretary on the Farmington River Coordinating Committee provided for in the Plan.

(b) FEDERAL ROLE.—(1) The Director shall represent the Secretary in the implementation of the Plan and the provisions of this Act with respect to the segment designated by section 3, including ongoing review of the consistency of the Plan with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the review of proposed federally assisted water resources projects which could have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the segment was established, as authorized under section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(2) In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the river segment designated by section 3, the Secretary, pursuant to section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, shall offer to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Connecticut and its relevant political subdivisions identified in the amendment made by such section 3 and, pursuant to section 11(b)(1) of such Act, shall make a similar offer to the Farmington River Watershed Association. The Secretary, pursuant to such section 11(b)(1), also may enter into cooperative agreements with other parties who may be represented on the Committee. All coop-

erative agreements provided for in this Act shall be consistent with the Plan, and may include provisions for financial or other assistance from the United States to facilitate the long-term protection, conservation, and enhancement of the segment designated by such section 3 and the implementation of the Plan.

(3) The Secretary may provide technical assistance, staff support, and funding to assist in the implementation of the Plan.

(4) Implementation of this Act through cooperative agreements as described in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not constitute National Park Service administration of the segment designated by section 3 for purposes of section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and shall not cause such segment to be considered as being a unit of the National Park System.

(c) WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS.—(1) In determining whether a proposed water resources project would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the segment designated by section 3 was included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, the Director shall specifically consider the extent to which the project is consistent with the Plan.

(2) For purposes of implementation of section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Plan, including the detailed analysis of instream flow needs incorporated therein and such additional analysis as may be incorporated in the future, shall serve as the primary source of information regarding the flows needed to maintain instream resources and the potential compatibility between resource protection and possible water supply withdrawals.

(d) LAND MANAGEMENT.—The zoning ordinances duly adopted by the towns of Hartland, Barkhamsted, New Hartford, and Canton, Connecticut, including the "river protection overlay districts" in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be deemed to satisfy the standards and requirements of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. For the purpose of section 6(c), such towns shall be deemed "villages" and the provisions of that section, which prohibit Federal acquisition of lands by condemnation, shall apply to the segment designated by section 3.

## SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Committee" means the Farmington River Coordinating Committee referred to in section 4.

(2) The term "Director" means the Director of the National Park Service.

(3) The term "Plan" means the comprehensive management plan for the Connecticut segment of the Farmington River prepared by the Farmington River Study Committee and the National Park Service, which is known as the "Upper Farmington River Management Plan" and dated April 29, 1993.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

## SEC. 6. FUNDING AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including the amendment to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act made by section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2815, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2815 is a bill introduced by Representative JOHNSON of Connecticut and cosponsored by the entire delegation from that State, including our colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. GEJDENSON.

It deals with a segment of the Farmington River, in Connecticut required by earlier legislation to be studied for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The study determined that the segment is indeed eligible and suitable for designation as a component of that System.

The bill would provide such a designation, and would lay the foundation for appropriate management through cooperative agreements between the National Park Service, the State of Connecticut, relevant local governments, and the other parties who have participated in the study and in developing a comprehensive management plan for the affected area.

The Natural Resources Committee amended the bill to make it more closely conform with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and with the normal provisions that have been included in other similar bills, but the version before the House retains the most important provisions of the bill as introduced.

Like the original bill, the reported version provides for management through cooperative agreements between the Secretary, the State of Connecticut, and the relevant local governments, in accordance with the existing plan developed by the Farmington River Study Committee.

Also like the original bill, the reported bill recognizes that existing local zoning ordinances meet the requirements of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, so that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act's prohibition on Federal use of condemnation will apply.

While the bill would not prevent the Federal Government from acquiring land in the area from willing sellers, implementation of the bill will not require any such acquisitions or Federal management of any lands that are not owned by the United States.

Instead, the bill provides the basis for cooperation between the National Park Service, State and local officials, and Connecticut citizens groups interested in sound management of the designated segment of the Farmington River.

I want to thank Congresswoman JOHNSON for her leadership on this matter. She has worked hard in cooperation with the committee and the administration to make it possible for us to bring to the floor a sound bill that will provide appropriate protection for outstanding resource values associated with the Farmington River. It is a bill that deserves the approval of the House, and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2815 which was introduced by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] who is a hard working member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This legislation, which has been fully explained by the Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], would add a 14-mile segment of the Farmington River to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It is the result of many years of negotiations between Representative JOHNSON and the many diverse river users in her district.

Although I believed the original bill had stronger provisions protecting the rights or private landowners and the autonomy of local governments than the version reported by the Natural Resources Committee, I continue to support this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2815.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to strongly endorse this bill to designate a 14-mile segment of the Farmington River in my district as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This designation has the support of my Connecticut colleagues in this chamber and the other body, as well as the enthusiastic support of the people in the river towns.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin my remarks by thanking the large number of unselfish citizens who have made this 10-year journey to designation possible. Starting with the Chairman and Mr. HANSEN and their able staffs, I must say that they have been nothing but gracious and professional in working with me on this unique designation, and my staff and constituents. I thank you.

This effort could not have been successful without the steadfast commitment and hands-on involvement of Nathan Frohling and his predecessor, Suzi Wilkins, and the board and members of the Farmington River Watershed Association [FRWA] based in Simsbury, CT.

Suzi is now at American Rivers here in Washington, and her colleagues at that organization also have helped move the process along.

I also am pleased to recognize the efforts of the metropolitan district commission [MDC] in helping us reach this agreement. Without their willingness to acknowledge my constituents' concerns, this bill would not be before us today.

The 17 members of the Farmington River Advisory Committee also deserve our gratitude for the tremendous number of volunteer hours they have invested in this project. Representing the five towns along the river, as well as the Governor's office, the State department of environmental protection, the MDC, and the FRWA, these men and women held a number of public meetings and open workshop to share information about the importance of designation and led their respective communities to the unanimous decision to press this bill forward. This legislation is the culmination of their efforts and bears not only their fingerprints, but also their blood, sweat, and tears.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must single out Mr. Phil Huffman of the National Park Service's regional office in Boston for his tireless support over the years. Phil successfully quarterbacked this effort, keeping everyone at the negotiating table, and injecting a level of professionalism that is both refreshing and appreciated by all. The entire Park Service team, Phil Huffman, Drew Parkin, and John Haubert, have been trusted allies in this endeavor and, on behalf of my Farmington Valley constituents, I thank them for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proud moment for the people of the Farmington River towns. In an area of the country that is not well known for its wide open spaces, we nonetheless have some natural wonders that deserve consideration under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Thus, I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to endorse this innovative approach to protecting a relatively urban river for future generations to enjoy.

Private lands rivers like the Farmington present a special challenge to Federal legislators because most riparian landowners in my district already consider themselves stewards of the West Branch and are not willing to turn over control to a far-away bureaucracy. Consequently, this legislation relies on a detailed management plan written by local folks, and clarifies that Federal land acquisition and day-to-day Federal management are not part of the bill. With this bill, the Congress also makes clear that there are ways to craft wild and scenic legislation that addresses the concerns of private landowners in relatively populated areas.

Another unique aspect of this bill is its power-sharing arrangement between



the local and Federal governments. Because we are a region with a strong tradition of town meeting governance, we have not been able to benefit from Federal programs that require a relinquishing of local authority. In this bill, we have created a new model that should enable us to participate more fully in federally supported land and river preservation programs.

Local land management programs, adopted as town ordinances, have put in place a preservation plan that, coupled with the comprehensive management plan, meets Federal wild and scenic standards. By resting designation on the enforcement of those local laws implementing the river management plan, we have created a Federal/State partnership that achieves wild and scenic goals in harmony with New England tradition.

For these reasons, this legislation is important to all of the Northeast, as there are other rivers in my part of the country that may need the same attention given to the Farmington. In the absence of changes in statutory language, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act should, under the committee's able stewardship, continue to acknowledge the necessity of flexibility, as it has succeeded in doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to endorse the committee's work on my bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD materials pertinent to this legislation, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

Hartford, CT, November 12, 1993.

Hon. NANCY L. JOHNSON,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR NANCY: Enclosed are copies of recent testimony by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection on rivers issues currently before Congress.

We are supporting S. 1332 and H.R. 2815 concerning designation of the Farmington River into the National Wild and Scenic River System.

We also have a high level of interest in SB 589 and HR 1348 establishing a Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor.

I would appreciate your assistance in helping to make these worthwhile proposals to reality. My staff and I are available to answer any questions you may have. I can be reached at (203) 566-2110.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY R.E. KEENEY,  
Commissioner.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

Hartford, CT, October 26, 1993.

Hon. BRUCE VENTO,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks,  
Forests, and Public Lands, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VENTO: Thank you for the opportunity to offer strong support for HR 2815. The Farmington Wild and Scenic River Act. Governor Weicker, the members

of the Connecticut General Assembly and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection all support designation of the 14 miles of the Farmington River immediately below the Goodwin Dam as part of the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Farmington River is a unique resource in Connecticut, providing some of the finest fish and wildlife habitats and recreational opportunities in the state, while meeting needs for water supply and waste assimilation.

The Connecticut Segment of the Farmington has been found by the Farmington River Study Committee to be eligible for designation based on the presence of outstanding fisheries, recreation, wildlife, and historic resources. The Study Committee has also found that segment to be suitable for designation based on strong state and local support for designation and the adoption of an appropriate management plan.

The development of the management plan was a key factor in gaining state support for designation. I have had the pleasure of representing the Governor of Connecticut on the Farmington River Study Committee since its inception. In carrying out this responsibility, one of my jobs has been to consider how designation would fit with out ongoing efforts to manage water and related natural resources and ensure the public health and safety of Connecticut's residents. Current state resource management and protection activities include water allocation and diversion permitting, water supply, water quality of fish and wildlife and recreation management programs.

I am convinced that the "Upper Farmington River Management Plan" developed by the Study Committee effectively balances the broader state management responsibilities for protecting public health and safety with the need for river protection. A number of elements of the plan are significant to the state, and are described below. The plan:

(1) establishes a 100 foot area on either side of the river as the focus of local land use protection efforts for the river and the immediate riparian corridor. The four towns which border the study segment have adopted river protection districts through local zoning to ensure the appropriate management of private lands.

(2) provides for maintenance and enhancement of the values which qualify the river for national designation, including water quality, recreational use opportunities, fish and wildlife, historic resources and scenic values.

(3) allows for consideration of future water supply withdrawals of up to 7.3 billion gallons per year, while maintaining the character of the river and its wild and scenic values.

(4) requires a number of state statutory changes to assure the highest level of water quality protection.

(5) establishes a Farmington River Coordinating Committee (FRCC) to coordinate implementation of the plan.

(6) requires notification of the National Park Service and the FRCC of any actions requiring a state permit, and allows NPS intervention in uses, withdrawals or other actions within or affecting the segment which require state or federal permits, funding or approvals.

The use of a comprehensive instream flow study in the planning process has allowed the analysis of varying river flows to determine the water resource management regimes needed to protect and enhance the river. A significant provision of the plan,

based on this analysis, is the ability to consider future use for public water supply if it can be shown that such use is not detrimental to the wild and scenic values. This provision allows us to fulfill our responsibility to provide pure and adequate supplies of drinking water to state residents should it become necessary in the future.

It is my belief that implementation of the plan will enhance our ability to protect the river's wild and scenic values by allowing more public input into federal and state resource management programs. I fully support designation of the Upper Farmington into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and implementation of the Upper Farmington River Management Plan as the cornerstone for such designation.

It is the intent of the State of Connecticut to work with the Federal Government, the communities in the region, local interest groups and the strong base of local support to ensure effective management of the Upper Farmington once it is designated. Thank you again for the opportunity to present this statement of support for HR 2815.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT MOORE,  
Deputy Commissioner.

[From the Hartford (CT) Courant, Feb. 25, 1994]

BILL WOULD PROTECT RIVER'S BEAUTY,  
WILDLIFE AND RECREATION

(Nancy L. Johnson and Norman Rogers, Jr.)

Images of spectacular beauty, diverse wildlife and recreational bounty come to mind when the Farmington River is mentioned. But the Farmington is under increasing pressure for exploitation precisely because of its rare quality.

A bill before Congress would designate the upper 14 miles of the Farmington River as a national "Wild & Scenic River." If enacted, this would be Connecticut's first Wild & Scenic designation and its single greatest river-protection achievement. Wild & Scenic designation provides the highest level of protection a river can receive in the United States. It is the strongest authority for protecting rivers from harmful diversions and discharges that threaten their quality.

Designation would prohibit any water-related project licensed, permitted or funded by the federal government that would be adverse to the river. It would establish strict standards for withdrawing or diverting water—standards that exceed current state law.

In addition to the strong federal protection, a Farmington River management plan, completed last April, establishes a high standard of protection for the river and is the cornerstone for designation.

Together, Wild & Scenic designation and the management plan will safeguard the river's beauty, fish, wildlife, ecological health and recreational uses.

An unprecedented level of local control was built into the proposed designation. Special measures are included that prohibit any federal land condemnation or management. Private lands will remain private; their regulation will remain a local responsibility.

The Farmington River Management Plan embodies an unprecedented level of cooperation among diverse river interests, such as Farmington Valley towns, the Farmington River Watershed Association and other river-advocacy groups, the state, riverfront property owners, the Metropolitan District Com-

mission, the National Park Service and river recreationists.

The goal most passionately sought by Farmington Valley towns is the protection that Wild & Scenic designation provides against a harmful diversion of water from the river. Although not an absolute ban, designation will prevent all diversions that the people of the Farmington Valley are worried about—those that would adversely affect the river. Under designation, any proposed diversion that would weaken the protection and integrity of the river would be considered adverse and prohibited.

An independently conducted study was performed to determine the flows needed to protect the river's natural, recreational and scenic characteristics. It found that at peak flows, such as those that cause spring flooding, there is more water than is needed to protect these characteristics. In extreme high-flow conditions, water could theoretically be stored to help augment river flows later and, if sufficient, provide for some withdrawal.

However, Wild & Scenic designation is by no means a permit, encouragement or invitation for withdrawal. To the contrary, designation and the management plan establish strict conditions and standards that guarantee protection of the river if a limited diversion is ever proposed. These standards will protect fish habitat, canoeing and kayaking, tubing, fishing and water quality.

Although a diversion is theoretically compatible with strong river protection, the burden of proof would be on the applicant to demonstrate compatibility between an actual diversion proposal and the river-protection standards established in the management plan.

With Wild & Scenic designation, the river's characteristics must remain as they are—or be enhanced—before any diversion could proceed. Without Wild & Scenic designation, there are no such guarantees.

The Wild & Scenic Study has been conducted through an open public process, and there is extensive public support for designation. In addition to public forums, workshops, open study-committee meetings, thousands of volunteer hours have been dedicated toward achieving designation.

The Wild & Scenic Study Committee, which includes representatives of Hartland, Colebrook, Barkhamsted, New Hartford, Canton, the Farmington River Watershed Association, the Department of Environmental Protection, Gov. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. and the Metropolitan District Commission, gave its unanimous support. Several committee leaders also contributed to this article: Nathan Frohling, director of the watershed association; state Sen. James T. Fleming, R-Simsbury; Robert Moore, deputy commissioner of DEP, Anthony Gallichio, chairman of the MDC, and Philip Huffman, study manager for the National Park Service.

Other local groups, such as the Farmington River Anglers Association and the Farmington River Club, have participated actively and endorsed designation. Many other organizations have also endorsed designation, including American Rivers, the National Audubon Society and the Sierra Club.

The greatest achievement, however, is that residents of the Farmington Valley have dared to make a difference and acted to protect something they love.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2815, the Farmington Wild and Scenic River Act. I am an original cosponsor of the bill, which is supported by the entire Connecticut congressional delega-

tion. This legislation strikes a balance between many interests, and will allow us to protect some of the most magnificent river segments in my State.

The segment of the Farmington that this bill will protect includes a spectacular gorge, known as Satan's Kingdom, which is renowned for its white water and is extremely popular with many river users. The river also provides habitat for Atlantic salmon, which the Fish and Wildlife Service is studying for designation as a threatened species. Numerous historic structures can be found on the river's banks as well.

Residents in several towns along the Farmington River have been working for wild and scenic designation for about 6 years. Many varied interests and river users have been involved in developing plans for the region. The National Park Service has studied the area and concluded that it has significant resources worthy of protection. The Farmington River Study Committee produced a management plan last spring which was unanimously approved by its members. This bill is the result of a consensus process.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill we will be able to protect valuable natural resources, which provide habitat to numerous species, and many historic sites. In addition, wild and scenic designation will ensure that various river users will be able to enjoy it for years to come. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today a bill to protect one of Connecticut's most treasured resources—the Farmington River. This bill, sponsored by my good friend Mrs. JOHNSON and supported by all of us in the Connecticut delegation, would protect 14 miles of the west branch of the Farmington River by including it in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

A wild and scenic designation is the only protection that can permanently guarantee that no federally licensed or funded water project be allowed to harm the river. It would protect the waterway's fisheries, wildlife, and recreational potential, and contribute significantly to our enjoyment of the river.

Today's legislation will not only protect the Farmington River, but has the potential to help rivers nationwide. The bill contains important language to promote local autonomy and self-determination, which will help local governments settle the sometimes difficult issues which arise during consideration of preservation status.

This local stewardship approach states that the Federal Government cannot pursue land acquisition or management, ensuring that local authorities will retain significant influence. This can be particularly important when rivers abut private property. It is an important distinction which should contribute to greater preservation efforts.

This legislation is the result of cooperation among many different parties—Governor Weicker, the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, the Metropolitan District Commission, the Farmington River Watershed Association, and local municipal authorities. Many people have worked together on this project—this bill is testimony to their efforts and to the merits of their project.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work of Chairman VENTO and his subcommittee for moving this important legislation forward. I would also like to commend my colleague Mrs. JOHNSON for her hard work and encourage this Chamber to quickly pass this bill.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2815, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE HAMILTON FISH, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to inform our colleagues of the unanticipated announcement by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative HAMILTON FISH, JR., of his intention to retire at the end of this Congress. This is an irreparable loss for our region, our State, and for the Congress.

HAM FISH has been an inspiration to all of us and to the American people. His 26 years of dedicated service in this chamber is a benchmark of public service that will not soon be duplicated. His outstanding leadership, his intellect, his dedication and his sterling character will be greatly missed.

Since his first election to Congress in 1968, HAM FISH impressed this Chamber and the entire Nation with his selfless devotion to public service. His brilliant legal mind was demonstrated in the spotlight of the Watergate crisis when, as a junior member of the House Judiciary Committee, we had the benefit of his dedication to upholding constitutional law and his insistence on integrity.

Having since risen to the position of ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, HAM FISH led the fight to strengthen our civil rights laws and the judicial process. His crusade on behalf of a realistic and equitable immigration law is one of the many ways he was of immeasurable service to our Nation. He always maintained close contact with his own constituency and the people of the Hudson Valley always knew he could be counted on as a leading spokesperson for the interests of our region.

HAM FISH brought to this chamber a long family tradition of public service.



His father, his grandfather, and his great-grandfather blazed a path in this Chamber which would have been difficult for any individual to follow. HAM did so in a manner which would have made his forbearers and all Americans proud.

I extend best wishes for good health and happiness to HAM, to his wife Mary Ann, and his entire family. I assure them that he will be sorely missed in the Congress and by the many Americans who looked up to his particular brand of Public Service leadership and devoted Americanism.

□ 1312

**COMMUNICATION FROM ACTING DIRECTOR, NONLEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) laid before the House the following communication from the Acting Director, Non-Legislative and Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 9, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Office of Finance has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

RANDALL B. MEDLOCK,  
Acting Director.

**SPECIAL ORDERS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAESLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and under previous orders of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

**SHINING STARS IN EDUCATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is in the midst of a serious debate about education reform, and much is being said about where our schools are lacking. But as we focus on giving our communities, school boards, parents and teachers the tools to improve the education of our children, we must be careful not to focus solely on the bad news and overlook the success stories. Even the best-intentioned and most far-reaching education reform would serve no real purpose if it were not for the people involved in making learning

a reality. Today I rise to salute the teachers, thousands of caring and giving individuals who face up to the tremendous challenges and distractions and go on opening the doors of knowledge for children every day. Specifically, I would like to applaud two award-winning teachers from my district. Georgia Brown is a science teacher at J. Colin English Elementary School in North Fort Myers and Janet McGregor is a math teacher at Deep Creek Elementary School in Port Charlotte. They visited me in Washington while attending a program for the 1993 presidential awards for excellence in science and mathematics teaching. These national awards confer much-deserved recognition and appreciation on some of this Nation's most outstanding teachers. Ms. Brown and Ms. McGregor bring innovation, caring, and boundless enthusiasm into their classrooms, where they serve as important role models to their children. They also stand as shining stars of example in our communities. In addition to highlighting specific efforts of certain individuals, the prestigious Presidential Award Program works to underscore the benefits and rewards of teaching, encouraging other qualified individuals to join the education field. Teachers across this country are not only educating our children—but helping to secure a promising future for our country. They deserve our gratitude and support. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to commend Ms. Brown and Ms. McGregor to your attention and to recognize them as outstanding teachers.

**OUR NATION'S BUDGET**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 60 minutes, as the majority leader's designee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, last week this body engaged in a debate over our Nation's budget, and we had a vigorous debate over a variety of proposals, and we finally passed out a budget for this country.

This week, beginning tomorrow, we are going to debate whether or not we should have a constitutional amendment to our budget, that is, a constitutional amendment to balance our Federal budget. Once again, we will be engaged in the debate and discussion about priorities and about how we can and should restructure our Government in order to have fiscal responsibility and fiscal sanity in this country.

I would like to take a few moments in between these two debates and try to gain a little perspective on where we are and where we are going.

You know, back at home in Maine, I have had a variety of people in the business community ask me, "Well, Congressman, why cannot the Govern-

ment act a bit more like a business? Why can it not be more focused and disciplined? Why can it not do more and function more like we in the business world have to function?"

I thought a lot about that, and I just want everyone to think a minute about what it would be like today to take over a business that used to be very profitable, but because of bad mismanagement is now failing. Your job is to turn that business around. What do you do?

Well, I suggest that there are two basic things you are going to do at the very least. No. 1, you are going to look at the budget of your company, and you are going to ask yourself how much of the expenditures that we are engaged in have nothing to do with the success of our company. And as difficult and as painful as it may be, if you are going to succeed as a company, you are going to make the difficult and painful cuts necessary to keep that business afloat.

But the second thing you are going to do, which is probably, in my view, just as important as the first, is you are going to have a business plan. You are going to set some goals, what you want that company doing, where you want it to be. You are going to create a strategy to reach those goals, and then you are going to make investments to put that strategy to work. You may need a new wing to your plant. You may need some new equipment, perhaps some new computer technology. You may need to train or retrain some of your work force. You may need to hire people with different skill levels.

But whatever it is, whatever it takes, you make an investment that will make your strategy reach the goal that you have set for your company.

It may set you back in the short run. You may have to borrow capital to make those investments in the short run. But you measure the wisdom of those investments and the capacity of those investments to get you where you want to go to reach your goals. You look long term, and in the long term, you seek to bring your company back to life, producing the goods and services that you want it to produce and to reach that level of profit that you seek to reach.

Now, why, ladies and gentlemen, can we not in Washington look at our budget in much the same way? Why can we not have a budget like most budgets in most households of this country, like the budgets of all solvent businesses in this country, that divides itself and divides our spending into two fundamentally different categories—capital investment on the one hand and operating expenses on the other hand—so that we take a look at where we want this country to go, what are the tools and strategies that we need to get our country there, and develop a long-

range strategy, an investment strategy that puts this country to work?

Now, what does that mean? Well, I had the pleasure this morning of meeting with citizens from my State, members of the Maine Municipal Association, who came in. There were city and town managers, mayors, city and town councilors, and others who day in and day out have to struggle with municipal budgets and an economy that is in a recession, people who are facing great difficulties, and they came to ask for some help.

They were saying that, "If we are going to have to meet some of the responsibilities that you are asking us to meet, some of the responsibilities, and we think some of the goals are very laudable, very good, clean water, for example, sewage systems that work, infrastructure, roads and bridges and rail systems that serve our community and build our economy."

□ 1320

We think these are good things, but we need help. We need investment. We need the opportunity to take these things and put them into operation without breaking the backs of the property taxpayers of our community and the small businesses of our community that are having a very difficult time making ends meet.

I thought about the two debates, last week's debate over the budget on the one hand and the balanced budget amendment that we will be debating tomorrow on the other hand. I took a look at some of the alternatives to the budget passed on this floor last week, specifically the one that was sponsored by, promoted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], for whom I have the greatest respect, and I saw in some of the very programs and investments that are so critical to these Maine communities, and I saw proposals for cuts.

The Community Development Block Grant Program, for example, that takes Federal dollars and helps to meet critical needs in local communities without breaking the backs of property taxpayers was proposed to be cut. I looked at important loan and grant programs, revolving fund programs to help the cause of clean water in these communities, and developing sewer systems and infrastructure that works. I saw those proposed to be cut.

I have to ask myself the question: What ultimately is going to get this budget under control? What ultimately is the key to our success as a country when it comes to our fiscal problems? The answer is: Our economy, the creation of jobs and jobs growth, investment, and productivity; that is the key.

So, we have a proposal before us that seeks to undermine and cut the very economic foundation that communities across this country need in order to be

successful, investments that are needed to produce goods and services efficiently, investments that are needed to take products from plants and get them to the marketplace efficiently, investments that communities are seeking so that they can provide that kind of economic assistance while not breaking the backs of our property taxpayers.

And I look at a budget that includes as cuts those very investments, and I ask: Why? What is wrong with this picture?

Well, I frankly think, ladies and gentlemen, that what is wrong with this picture is that we have developed in this country a vision that is simply too narrow. In the business world, we look at investments too often and look at the returns that will be provided in the next quarterly profit sheets. In Government, in politics, in Washington, D.C., too often we look at these issues and these questions and these resolutions and we see them only in terms of the next election.

We have got to change. We have got to change in the private sector; we have got to change in the public sector. We have to begin to look at our investments long term, not just in terms of what the next quarterly reports are going to show us but in terms of what is the long-term strength of these communities and the corporations, what that is going to be with the long-term ramifications for our communities and our neighborhoods and our working families.

The same is true here. We should not be immune from that test. Members of Congress have got to take a look at these votes and see not just what the ramifications are in the next election cycle but what the ramifications are for the next generation of Americans, whether or not we are going to take the tough stands today to generate a return of economic strength and growth tomorrow.

We have got to look ahead. But we have got to have the tools to put the proposals before us in that prism. Judge these proposals on the basis of whether or not, A, we can afford them in terms of operating expenses day to day; B, whether or not long-term investments are going to generate economic strength and growth for tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, the budget structure that we have today makes no distinction between capital investment on the one hand and operating expenses on the other. That is wrong, it is shortsighted, and it needs to change.

Mr. Speaker, I testified before the group of Members of the House and Senate who worked over the last several months to reorganize Congress, to restructure Congress, to reform Congress. And I proposed, as one of my major proposals, that we change all that by dividing our budget into those

two categories and that when it comes to the first category of capital investment, that we engage in a national debate about what critical investments we need to make today in order to increase productivity, increase private investment, increase economic growth and job creation, and focus our debate on that.

Pass a capital budget geared to that, and then measure the success of that capital budget on the degree to which this country moves forward and meets those economic goals.

You know, I am a member of the Democratic Party, I am a proud member of the Democratic Party, but I like to make reference to a Republican President of a few years ago who understood this notion, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Eisenhower looked across this country and he gave a vision of a National Highway System, and he said, "You know, it may take a few decades for us to get there, but I envision a national highway system that will not only create jobs in the creation and building of that National Highway System, but will create thousands and thousands of jobs once it is built by making our transportation system in this country that much more efficient."

Well, it took a vision, it took some investments, and it took capital, but we put thousands and thousands of people to work, and we have in fact built, 35 years later, that Interstate Highway System that is doing the job it was set out to do. It took some vision, it took some investments, and we are now reaping the returns on that investment.

You know, when I look around the planet and I see those nations that we are competing against in the new, emerging global economic competition of the future, I see nations that are making enormous investments in this kind of capital investment that we are talking about here this afternoon, investments in roads and bridges, in first-class rail systems, first-class ports, first-class communications systems, telecommunications systems, the kinds of investments that they are seeing as critical to their nations' success in new, emerging competition of the future.

President Clinton has laid out some challenges for this Congress in a very similar fashion. Vice President GORE has talked a lot about the super-highway of telecommunications. I was very pleased that President Clinton came into Maine and talked about the need to give our commercial shipbuilders the chance to compete internationally and to join with us in Congress in making an investment of dollars to assist those shipbuilders to do that job with shipyard modernization, developing new technologies, providing low-cost loans for those who want to buy American-made ships in the commercial market.



This makes sense, ladies and gentlemen. There is a \$356 billion commercial market out there in this next decade that independent analysts are telling us is going to be there—for those nations who are prepared to seize that opportunity, that is. If we are going to seize that opportunity, we need to make the investments. Those are examples of investments that we are making.

But tomorrow we are going to have a debate over a balanced budget amendment that makes no distinction between those two categories of spending, that assumes that operating expenses are exactly the same as capital investments and that we are going to establish a constitutional amendment that will say that we must balance our budget at a certain period of time, period. All things look the same, all budget categories are the same. It makes no difference if it is capital investment or an operating expense, we balance that budget.

□ 1330

Well, thank goodness, while my specific recommendation did not find itself in the final report of my colleagues' recommendations for a form of this Congress, it has made its way into this debate, and tomorrow this Congress is going to have the opportunity to make a distinction between these two types of spending and establish a constitutional amendment that says that, yes, we must, and we will, balance the operating side of our budget, that like any family, like any solvent business, we can only spend what we take in in any given year when it comes to our operating expenses. But it recognizes, novel in this debate, a thing called capital investment and the need for a capital investment strategy, and it establishes, as part of this process, a capital budget within the Federal budget in which we will make decisions and take a look at the long range implications for investments that we make today on our economy tomorrow.

As my colleagues know, even the cuts in those fundamental ingredients to make economic growth that were proposed last week in the Kasich alternative, even those cuts in the things that the communities in my State care so much about in terms of giving them economic strength, even those cuts were not enough to balance this budget, that at a point in time those budget numbers go up, and we are going to have to take a look once again at what additional cuts are going to have to be made in order to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Ladies and gentlemen, if you agree that the key to solving our deficit problem is economic growth and strength, then you must agree that we need a strategy to build on that economic growth and strength, and that includes critical investments that will

help our economies grow: roads, bridges, rail systems, communication systems, ports, the basic building blocks of strong economic growth, the investments that generate a return on investment for our workers, for our families, for our companies."

My colleagues do not need to be rocket scientists or political pundits to understand how this works. Go back to that same business that we started out with trying to save, and think about the fact that we may want to make some additional investments, perhaps build a new plant. Where is it going to be? Well, in one area we have got an area that has a first class rail system. We have got a first class airport. We have got a water and sewer system that is state-of-the-art. We have got workers who are trained, who, first of all, know how to read and write, and, second, are trained with the basic skills that one needs to be a success. And we have a vocational school and a university system nearby willing to work with us and make sure that our additional needs are met. My colleagues, that is community A.

Community B has long believed that what we need to do is save our budgets by cutting, and cutting and cutting, and so we may not have the best roads, but we will have what we got. We may not have a decent rail system, we may not have decent ports, we may not have those basic building blocks that someone in Washington was once on the floor of the House talking about. But we are trying to keep our tax rate low, and of course we are not getting much help from the Federal Government, so we do the best we can.

Well, I say to my colleagues, "If you're that businessperson seeking where you're going to make that investment, where is it going to be; community A or community B? I would suggest, if you want the best return on your dollar, it's going to be community A."

As my colleagues know, very often on the floor of this House we have these pitched, ideological battles waging day after day, sometimes hour after hour. One side thinks that Government is inherently incapable, inherently incompetent, and the best thing we can do in this Chamber is to eliminate and reduce Government to the greatest degree possible. "Get out of the way," they say, "of the private sector."

And then we have another group who believes that the private sector, the business sector, cannot be trusted, that if we do not watch their every move, they are going to create dangerous work places, they are going to rip off the consumer, they are going to engage in scandals like the S&L scandal, they are going to pollute our air and water and laugh all the way to the bank, and we have got to watch their every step.

Now we have different variations of those debates, but very often we can

see one of those two polarities emerging in those debates. It is time for this community to turn a corner. We cannot afford those old, tired ideological debates of the past.

The fact is, my colleagues, that wealth is generated in this country by the private sector, and, unless the private sector is strong and growing, I do not care what we want Government to do. It is not going to be able to do it because we are not going to have the resources to do it. The private sector generates wealth and growth, and we have to understand that and respect that.

But at the same time, if the private sector wants to be successful, it is going to need a vital public sector that is working and working well to get those products to market, to provide employees that are willing and ready to do the job, to provide for an environment that is clean and healthy and the kind of environment that we want to bring up our families in. The public sector and the private sector need to be working together, not pitted against one another in a senseless, ideological debate, but working together to meet the goals of this country, and that is a vital, strong, and growing economy.

We need to look ahead, beyond this next election cycle, beyond the next quarterly reports for profits for a company. We have got a look at the next generation. We have got to look at the payback and investments that we make today, tomorrow.

Perhaps this is the most critical in the area of defense. As we all know, we are reducing defense spending in this country. It is reasonable and a sensible thing to do given the change in our world, given the elimination of the cold war threat of the former Soviet Union. It is a different world with different challenges requiring a different strategy and different investments, but along the way we find ourselves confronted with the very difficult, sometimes very bitter, reality that the defense plants are going to cut down their work force, other defense plants are going to close, and defense facilities across this country are going to be shaken down, and some are going to close completely. Never in this area of debate, and nowhere in this debate, is investment more important or planning ahead more important than when it comes to those communities that are suffering the loss of defense jobs, defense facilities, and private employers building weapons.

We have a vital industrial base in place out there that has been highly successful in building things that we needed during the cold war. They won the cold war for us, and we have first class military facilities all across this country that were built, and were supplied and were maintained by people who wanted to see this country succeed and meet the challenge of the cold war.

Now that the challenge has changed, and now that we are turning a page in our history, and closing down plants and closing down defense facilities, we owe it to those communities, to those workers, to those families who were there when we needed them in the cold war, to be there when they need us in this post-cold-war era, who offer this country enormous industrial strength, and assets, first class facilities, highly trained work forces, ready to go to work to rebuild the economic foundation of this country. And what they need is a nation that is forward looking enough, bold enough, visionary enough, and courageous enough to make the investments in those plants, in those facilities, in those communities, that will allow them to be successful in the post-cold-war era.

Yes, that is going to take investment. Yes, that is going to take capital. And, yes, we may not see the return on the capital between now and the next election, or perhaps the one after that.

□ 1340

But what we are going to see is an economy that is building up from the ground, a Government willing and able to make investments in those industrial assets that are so critical for our success, and we are going to see communities beginning to thrive, building the products and producing the services that we need in the post-cold-war era just as they produced the weapons and services we needed in the cold war era. But we cannot do it if we continue this old ideological debate, if we continue to tolerate budget schemes that are way out of step with most businesses and households in this country, that do not give us the chance to look ahead and make those decisions.

Mr. Speaker, we have an enormous opportunity at this time, this week, to turn that corner, to change that budget debate, and to look ahead. I urge my colleagues and I urge everyone across America to rethink the balanced budget amendment, reject the balanced budget amendment that makes no distinction between capital investment on the one hand and operating expenses on the other, and to adopt the Wise amendment on this floor tomorrow. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] has taken what I just described and has put it in the form of an amendment for all to see, and he will be arguing tomorrow on the floor before this Congress and before this Nation, along with me and others who support this idea that we need to balance our operating side, because there is no question about it, we cannot take in any more than we spend in any year, but we need to distinguish between an operating budget on the one hand and a capital investment budget on the other hand and establish a capital investment strategy for this Nation that

looks ahead, that recognizes that the true strength of this country lies in our work force, in our communities, in our neighborhoods, and recognizes finally that successfully dealing with this budget crisis, and finally bringing fiscal sanity to this town and this institution is going to depend first and foremost on economic strength and economic growth. That is going to take vision, and that is going to take investment.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be an interesting debate tomorrow. I encourage my colleagues to engage in it fully, to consider this amendment, and perhaps starting tomorrow, we can turn this Nation around and get away from the silly debates, with those polarities that get us nowhere, and start talking about the working public and private, business and government, the American people, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, so we can begin to rebuild this Nation's economic strength and give our children the future they deserve.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE OFFICIALS MISLEAD PUBLIC, FALL SHORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have known for a long time that the Federal Reserve is not telling the American public the whole story about what it is doing. Records recently made available show how Federal Reserve officials have misled the public about their assessment of a possible recession that they knew might emerge from their own tight money policies. The situation I will describe is similar to 1994 because Federal Reserve officials publicly were warning about inflation while failing to fully report the threat of recession that Fed officials had discussed. The records now available for part of 1988 give a much better idea of what happened than the official public statements of the day.

The Fed keeps its true intentions from public view by releasing a totally unsatisfactory summary of what happens at its Federal Open Market Committee [FOMC] meetings where it decides on the Nation's monetary policy. A comparison of the summary of a 1988 FOMC meeting with the actual transcript shows disparities in what really went on and what was spoon-fed to an unwitting public when the Fed knew its policies might cause a recession. Do we still have that kind of misleading public posture by the Fed? Undoubtedly.

This lack of disclosure should come as no surprise. The public relies on officials who have been given the power to run large bureaucracies in a democratic government to act as their

agents and to make decisions that promote their general interests. These officials may have other objectives, such as maintaining and promoting the power of their bureaucracy. In other words, Government officials who have been given the power to run large bureaucracies and who do not have to personally stand for election can and often do have other objectives than the public interest. Making the public interest these officials' first priority is known in the social sciences as the agency problem.

The same problem occurs in private businesses where managers of corporations may have different objectives than the stockholders who own the corporation. For example, the managers may want to enhance their salaries rather than maximize the profits of the corporation.

One way to remedy the agency problem is to require full and accurate accountability. Officials of Government bureaucracies must be accountable to the public. This means complete and accurate records of each individual performance of our Government officials.

Unfortunately, the Federal Reserve has regressed to less accountability in 1976. The FOMC stopped releasing detailed minutes because it was trying to evade Freedom of Information Act requests. It falsely announced that it kept no detailed records of these meetings until last October when I was able to uncover the fact that the Fed has in its possession, 17 years of FOMC transcripts.

As a substitute, the Federal Reserve began publishing and still publishes a summary of its meetings 5 or 6 weeks after they occur. The summary does not attribute any statements to individual FOMC members, only final votes which rarely reveal dissents. The summary is a mostly boilerplate recounting of economic conditions that could be obtained from many financial reports in the media. The critical need for individual accountability is lost.

Last Wednesday the Federal Reserve began releasing the FOMC transcripts I have persuaded them to release. However, they only issued transcripts for the last half of 1988. I checked one of these summaries to see if it was an accurate reflection of the transcripts. Not surprising, it was not.

At the December 13-14, 1988 FOMC meeting, the transcript clearly shows that Chairman Greenspan and the FOMC perceived signs of a forthcoming recession. After they were presented with a staff summary about the economy, Chairman Greenspan told the FOMC members:

Having listened to all of this, certain things seem to be coming forth fairly clearly. One starts off with the quite credible concerns of Governors Kelley and LaWare about the dangers of a recession.

Then the transcript reveals that member after member of the FOMC



pleaded for tightening and even raising interest rates except for Governor Martha Seger who dissented. Many of these members are still on the FOMC. Here is what Governor LaWare said:

Let me just suggest that instead of ringing the gong, that in connection with this move we might just "jingle" the bell—that's a seasonal [Christmas] pun!—and perhaps not move the discount rate a full half point but rather move it a quarter point.

As history shows, they got their wish. The Federal funds rate rose to nearly 10 percent and their tightening was followed by a recession and by a recovery that the FOMC members also slowed to a crawl.

The inflation rate, which was officially 3.06 percent annual rate in December 1988, was overstated because of problems in the index known to the members of the FOMC. Nevertheless, the Fed decided to slay the chimerical dragon: The money supply fell to negative growth in February 1989, a product of the tighter Federal Reserve policy.

Buried in the six pages of summary later issued by the Federal Reserve and printed in the April 1989 Monthly Bulletin is the bland mention that some members cautioned that the risk of a recession stemming from substantial tightening of policy should not be overlooked. The tone of the summary can be summarized by the following quote:

Many expressed the concern that continued expansion at a relatively rapid pace raised the risk that inflation would intensify, given already high rates of capacity utilization in many industries and tight labor markets in many parts of the country.

Every American family knows what has happened. Unemployment rates went above 7 percent and are still high. There are continuing huge layoffs where workers leave good jobs and transfer to low-paying and part-time jobs.

It is time to have reasonable accountability from the Federal Reserve. I want complete transcripts and a record of what they are doing right now so the American public will know how each individual Fed official supports the current policy of raising interest rates to stop an inflation that no one can see.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today, and March 16 and 17.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, on March 17.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of Maine) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. PETRI.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of Maine) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. SKELTON in two instances.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. REED.

Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. ESHOO.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of California.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 16, 1994, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2759. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the report pursuant to section 376 of the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act will be submitted on or about April 30, 1994; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2760. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 1993 annual report of the National Credit Union Administration, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2761. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report regarding the types of projects and activities funded under the Drug Abuse Prevention Program for runaway and homeless youth, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11822; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2762. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a compilation and analysis of State activities in implementing the fifth year of the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Challenge Grant Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C.

5116a(1), 5116g; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2763. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on progress made in implementing the nursing facility staffing requirements, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396r note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2764. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the prospective drug utilization review demonstration projects, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 4401(c)(1)(D) (104 Stat. 1388-159); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2765. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Progress Through Partnerships: Office of Minority Health's Report to Congress," pursuant to Public Law 101-527, section 2 (104 Stat. 2313); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2766. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2767. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Addressing the Deficit: Budgetary Implications of Selected GAO Work"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2768. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2769. A letter from the Solicitor, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2770. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Federal Bureau of Prisons' annual report on functional literacy requirement for all individuals in Federal correctional institutions, pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2904 (104 Stat. 4914); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2771. A letter from the Secretary, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the annual audit report of the corps for the year ended December 31, 1993, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2772. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the report of building project survey for Springfield, IL, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2773. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the annual determination regarding the viability of the domestic uranium mining and milling industries for calendar years 1983 through 1992, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2210b(a); jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and Energy and Commerce.

2774. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1994," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Judiciary, Public Works and Transportation, Ways and Means, and Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FROST: Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 369. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for the expenses of investigations and studies by certain committees of the House in the 2d session of the 103d Congress; with an amendment (Rept. 103-433). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 387. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for continuing expenses of investigations and studies by certain committees of the House from April 1, 1994, through May 31, 1994. (Rept. 103-434). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 4030. A bill to assist victims of crime; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4031. A bill to provide for the prosecution as adults of juveniles 13 years old or older for certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4032. A bill to provide the penalty of death for certain crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4033. A bill to assist in the prevention of crime by initiating a comprehensive community justice program; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. SHEP-

HERD, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. JOHN-SON of South Dakota):

H.R. 4034. A bill to amend the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 to authorize grants for the expansion of recreation opportunities for at risk youth in urban areas with a high prevalence of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 4035. A bill to establish constitutional procedures for the imposition of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. LEVY):

H.R. 4036. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make organizations controlled by individuals who promote prejudice or bias based on race, religion, or ethnicity ineligible for assistance under programs administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PETRI) all by request:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 4038. A bill to direct the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing a national angler's license; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution to designate the month of September 1994 as "National Sewing Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 786: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 916: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1012: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 1497: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2448: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2599: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 2721: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 3205: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3333: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 3508: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3527: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3660: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3663: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3685: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3725: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 3771: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3866: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3900: Mr. EVANS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3940: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3981: Mr. POMEROY and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 3990: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 4013: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 4015: Mr. INSLEE.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 302: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LEVY, Mr. HORN, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 199: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. COX, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Res. 362: Mr. WILSON.

H. Res. 377: Mr. DREIER.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

79. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Clearwater, FL, relative to unfunded mandates upon local governments, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.